This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Y 4.Ag 8/1:101-2

WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION ASSISTANCE ACT AND REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1990 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

STANFORD LIBRARIES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS, FAMILY FARMS, AND ENERGY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 829

MARCH 1, 1989

Serial No. 101–2

CIS RECORD ONLY:

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
OCT 1989
JONSSON LIBRARY OF GOVT DOCUMENTS

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
96–470 WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

Digitized by Google

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

E (KIKA) DE LA GARZA, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., California
CHARLES ROSE, North Carolina
GLENN ENGLISH, Oklahoma
LEON E. PANETTA, California
JERRY HUCKABY, Louisiana
DAN GLICKMAN, Kansas
TONY COELHO, California
CHARLES W. STENHOLM, Texas
HAROLD L. VOLKMER, Missouri
CHARLES HATCHER, Georgia
ROBIN TALLON, South Carolina
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, JR., West Virginia
JIM OLIN, Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
RICHARD H. STALLINGS, Idaho
DAVID R. NAGLE, Iowa
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
CLAUDE HARRIS, Alabama
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado
MIKE ESPY, Mississippi
BILL SARPALIUS, Texas
ROY DYSON, Maryland
H. MARTIN LANCASTER, North Carolina

EDWARD R. MADIGAN, Illinois, *Ranking Minority Member*
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
RON MARLENEE, Montana
LARRY J. HOPKINS, Kentucky
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
BILL EMERSON, Missouri
SID MORRISON, Washington
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
TOM LEWIS, Florida
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
LARRY COMBEST, Texas
BILL SCHUETTE, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
WALLY HERGER, California
CLYDE C. HOLLOWAY, Louisiana
JAMES T. WALSH, New York

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

BERT R. PEÑA, *Staff Director*
DANIEL E. BRINZA, *Counsel*
CHARLES HILTY, *Minority Staff Director*
JAMES A. DAVIS, *Press Secretary*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS, FAMILY FARMS, AND ENERGY

HAROLD L. VOLKMER, Missouri, *Chairman*

JERRY HUCKABY, Louisiana
JIM OLIN, Virginia
RICHARD H. STALLINGS, Idaho
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
LEON E. PANETTA, California
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
CLAUDE HARRIS, Alabama

SID MORRISON, Washington
RON MARLENEE, Montana
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
BILL SCHUETTE, Michigan
WALLY HERGER, California

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 829, a bill to make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act	3
Morrison, Hon. Sid, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington, prepared statement	5
Volkmer, Hon. Harold L., a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, opening statement	1

WITNESSES

Dunlop, George S., Assistant Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture	11
Prepared statements	44, 46
Robertson, F. Dale, Chief, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	14
Prepared statement	54

SUBMITTED MATERIAL

Jahn, Laurence R., president, Wildlife Management Institute, letter of March 1, 1989	66
Howard, John J., county judge, Marie C. Lester, commissioner, and Lorence D. Savage, commissioner, Union County Court, letter of February 23, 1989	67

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION ASSISTANCE ACT AND REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1990 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR THE FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1989

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS, FAMILY FARMS, AND ENERGY,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1302, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Harold L. Volkmer (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Olin, Stallings, Jontz, Johnson, Harris, Morrison, Marlenee, Smith, Schuette, and Herger.

Also present: Representative E (Kika) de la Garza, chairman of the committee, and Representative Stenholm, member of the committee.

Staff present: Daniel E. Brinza, counsel; Vernie Hubert, associate counsel; Francie Monaghan, clerk; Timothy P. De Coster, James R. Lyons, James A. Davis, and Kraig Naasz.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. VOLKMER. The subcommittee will come to order.

Our first order of business today is to receive testimony on legislation I have introduced, along with my colleagues, to make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Assistance Act.

The measure pending before us today, H.R. 829, is essentially the same as the final version of a bill I sponsored last year which was approved by the House in the waning days of the session but which was not considered in the Senate.

Working with the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture last year, we drafted legislation, H.R. 4936, to authorize the use, under certain conditions, of funds available for fire fighting on Federal lands to reimburse foreign organizations for assistance in suppressing wildfires. In particular, the agency sought the authority in order to enlist the use of specialized aircraft from Canada to battle expected fires in the drought-stricken western United States.

We hoped to have this authority to the Agriculture and Interior Departments by the middle of summer of last year, but the legislation was bogged down for a while. As the severity of the fires in-

Digitized by Google

creased, members of this committee worked with others in the House and Senate and the administration and developed a measure, patterned after H.R. 4936, to provide this important authority on a temporary basis.

This bill was enacted into law and utilized to some extent by the administration. The authorities provided in that act expired on December 31, 1988.

It is my intention to expedite the consideration of this bill and to seek the assistance of other interested committees in doing likewise so that the agencies, which must prepare for this year's fire season, will know early on whether they can count on this additional authority.

[H.R. 829 and the prepared statement of Mr. Morrison follow:]

Digitized by Google

I

101st CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 829

To make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 2, 1989

Mr. Volkmer (for himself, Mr. Morrison of Washington, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Herger, Mr. Lehman of California, Mr. Schuette, Mr. Robert F. Smith, and Mr. Vento) introduced the following bill; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and Interior and Insular Affairs

---

A BILL

To make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wildfire Suppression Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. PERMANENT AUTHORITY.

The Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act (Public Law 100–428) is amended by repealing section 5.

Digitized by Google

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF

H.R. 829

Section 1--Short Title

Section 1 will provide that the bill may be cited as the "Wildfire Suppression Assistance Act".

Section 2--Permanent Authority

Section 2 will repeal section 5 of the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act to make permanent the authority provided under the Act.

Under current law, section 5 of the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act provides that the authority to enter into agreements under section 3(a), to furnish or accept emergency wildfire protection resources under section 3(b), or to incur obligations for reimbursement under section 3(c), terminates on December 31, 1988.

(Note: Section 3(a) of the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to enter into a reciprocal agreement with any foreign fire organization for mutual aid in furnishing wildfire protection resources for lands and other properties for which such Secretary or organization normally provides wildfire protection.

Section 3(b) of the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, in the absence of any agreement authorized under section 3(a) of the Act, to furnish emergency wildfire protection resources to any foreign nation when the furnishing of these resources is determined by such Secretary to be in the best interest of the United States, and to accept emergency wildfire protection resources from any foreign fire organization when the acceptance of these resources is determined by such Secretary to be in the best interest of the United States.

Section 3(c) of the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act authorizes the reimbursement for the costs incurred by the Government of Canada or a Canadian organization in furnishing wildfire protection resources to the Government of the United States under the Memorandum entitled "Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States Department of Agriculture and Environment Canada on Cooperation in the Field of Forestry-Related Programs" dated June 25, 1982, and the arrangement entitled "Arrangement in the Form of an Exchange of Notes Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America" dated May 4, 1982, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(a) or 3(b) of the Act.)

Digitized by Google

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE SID MORRISON
CONCERNING A BILL TO MAKE PERMANENT
"THE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION ACT"

MARCH 1, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join you in cosponsorship of this important legislation to make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act.

As you know, this act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into reciprocal agreements with any foreign fire organization for mutual aid in wildfire protection and suppression. This authority expired on December 31, 1988.

During our Subcommittee's joint hearing with the Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, I asked George Leanord, Associate Chief of the Forest Service, if that authority was useful and if it should be provided on a permanent basis? To which George responded that "it certainly was very useful and we strongly recommend that the Congress provide us that authority on a continuing basis."

H.R. 829, by simply removing the the December 31, 1988 termination date, would make this important authority permanent. And, as I alluded to, it is my understanding that the Administration strongly supports the enactment of H.R. 829.

Mr. Chairman, like you, I am hopeful that we can move this legislation through the Committee and to the floor in an expeditious manner, so that this authority will be restored before the 1989 summer fire season begins.

Digitized by Google

Mr. VOLKMER. Before calling on our first witness to consider H.R. 829, I would like to recognize any other gentleman of the subcommittee who would like to make a statement.

The gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I commend you on having the hearing and for expediting the passage of the legislation, and I stand in full support from among the associated peer remarks in support of this legislation.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much.

I will also note that the gentleman from Washington, I know, is tied up in other meetings and plans to be here at any moment. If he has a prepared statement, we will insert that statement in the record immediately following my opening statement.

At this time I would like to follow up with Mr. George Dunlop, Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Forest Service for USDA, and Mr. Dale Robertson, Chief of Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture who will be accompanied by Mr. George Leonard, Associate Chief, Forest Service, USDA.

Mr. Dunlop, we have a copy of your statement which you may summarize or read in full. I do not believe that either your paper or Mr. Robertson's is very lengthy, and so I leave that up to you to decide which one you would like to use.

But at any rate, the statements will be a part of the record.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And indeed, I think that the bottom line is that the administration strongly supports the enactment of H.R. 829.

You, in your opening remarks, explained the circumstances that were placed in this legislation, and have stated it well, and I will not repeat it.

But I would say that the Department regards the need for foreign fire-fighting resources as a recurring one whenever we have had catastrophic wildfires which result in a commitment of all available Federal and State fire-fighting resources.

And it may be of interest to the committee to know that because of the authorities that you granted last year on an emergency basis during the fires we had in the West, the Canadians were able to assist us with 125 helicopter support personnel, 12 airtankers, 8 Bird Dog aircraft, 1 Falcon infrared aircraft which was very instrumental in tracking the fires, 4 or 5 person water-handling teams, 200 pumps, and 3,895 Pulaski handtools.

So Mr. Chairman, this was an enormous benefit to us. I would say that the legislation, because it is reciprocal, would allow the United States and our various agencies to provide similar assistance to our Canadian friends or others who might help us.

So, we do support the legislation. We appreciate your introducing it, and the members of your committee in sponsoring it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you, Mr. Dunlop.

Before we go on I would like to recognize the chairman of the full committee who has joined us, and I also would like to mention that he was the one known primarily, along with the members, for being primarily responsible for getting that temporary legislation through the committee last year.

I would like to recognize the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Digitized by Google

All I have to say is that I am glad that you are moving on this legislation because yesterday at the chairman's meeting I advised the Speaker that they would do anything to move on this in the next 2 weeks.

Thank you, very much.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

All right, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I think Assistant Secretary Dunlop covered all of the key points, and I do not have anything to add.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Dunlop, the only question that I would ask would be about the equipment—that which was utilized with Canada—in your estimation, if you or Mr. Robertson or Mr. Leonard will be able to give me the answer on this, were we able to save some of our national resources in those fires in the West because of our utilization, and the second part of that question is if that is true, then the cost of it overcomes the—in other words, the savings, as we have suggested, the savings overcome the whole cost for what was approximately lost. Where are we on that?

Mr. DUNLOP. Mr. Chairman, I would like the Chief, if he would, to respond to that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, this equipment was very helpful. It resulted in us losing less forest land to fires, and I never looked at the cost versus benefit but I am just sure that what we have saved was equal to the cost or more.

Mr. VOLKMER. If we did not have this equipment we would have had to fight those fires anyway, in some way.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Without the equipment, then, we still had some cost anyway?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, you see most of those fires we had last year were in wilderness or in national parks where there was not much access. So, what we were really short of was aircraft, the helicopter people, the airtankers, the infrared aircraft, and so the Canadians filled a vital resource that we were completely out of.

Mr. VOLKMER. In other words, they filled the void?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. DUNLOP. And Mr. Chairman, I might add that I think one of the other contributions that they made was to boost the level of morale for our people. Our people, of course, had been committed for a long time and they were just tired and worn-out and reaching fatigue levels. The Canadian people came in and offered this help and assistance.

I think it is a major contribution to the fact that we had as few fatalities as we had in fighting these fires. It is a dangerous business, and that help came at a crucial time.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much.

With that I recognize the gentleman from Montana for any questions that you may have.

Mr. MARLENEE. What are the conditions right now? We have not had the amount of snow pack as we have had in the past, although the moisture conditions have improved, and I just would like for you to answer that question as far as what potential we have in

Digitized by Google

the West, because of the continued drought, for another like arrangement?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we are tracking the weather conditions very closely this year to try to predict what is likely to happen this summer.

Basically we are having a normal year in precipitation in most of the West, except California is low, and Arizona and New Mexico were low.

But if you look at the rest of the Western States it is about a normal year, which does not do much to off-set the deficit we have out there in water, but at least it is a normal year.

Mr. MARLENEE. When the trees were drier than the lumbers coming out of the hills perhaps we have a very serious situation, because I think that potential danger still exists.

Mr. LEONARD. It is going to take a relatively long period of normal rains, or hopefully some above-normal rains to build up the deficit in moisture in those heavy fuels. We will not get a full recovery in just 1 year.

Mr. MARLENEE. Is that right?

That is very interesting.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. The heavy fuels——

Mr. MARLENEE. The legislation will help us deal with the potential future disasters?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. MARLENEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would like to recognize the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. OLIN. I would like to commend the chairman for bringing this legislation before us. I think that everybody has cooperated fully.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, we first started it out of here.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. HERGER. I also thank the chairman and the committee for discussion of this legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JONTZ. I have no questions.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry. I would like to ask some questions until I receive the signing to include the markups on the bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

From March 11–15, 1988, my district experienced the largest grass-fire in recent history in the State of Texas.

This wildfire created some 5 million acres in property damage, 300 dead cows, and destroyed several camping areas. It also brought out probably the biggest fire fighting effort in Texas history with more than 400 fire fighters responding to battle the flames. The out-of-pocket costs to the Texas Forest Service in controlling this fire was approximately $297,110. The actual costs would have been much higher were it not for the fact volunteer firemen from every town within driving distance came to our assistance.

Digitized by Google

I think that this was a classical example of the State forestry agencies cooperating with the U.S. Forest Service. And I must say from the perspective of our office that the cooperation was very exemplary. For example, in addition to the U.S. Forest Service crews in Texas and New Mexico there were State forestry agency representatives from Arkansas, North Carolina, and Mississippi.

The Texas Forest Service spent more money on controlling this one fire than the Texas Forest Service receives annually through the Federal Property Rural Fire Prevention Program. In fact, the Texas Forest Service received $239,361 this year which is only 5.1 percent of the total fire-control budget.

I recognize that Federal funding to the States has continued to be significantly reduced for reasons that we are all aware. The U.S. Forest Service has accelerated its request to send fire crews out of State to assist in Federal-suppression projects.

Recently, for example, the Texas Forest Service has sent crews to Yellowstone, California, Oregon, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Montana to assist with these Federal fires.

It seems rather obvious that the Federal Government is turning more and more of its wildfire responsibility over to the States.

Mr. Dunlop, what is the basis for this action? Of course the Texas Forest Service is saying, when asked the question, is it not reasonable for the U.S. Forest Service to seek substantial increase in Federal funding to support the increase wildfire responsibilities being placed upon State forestry organizations?

Mr. VOLKMER. Could we hold onto this? I thought you were going to talk about the financial problems down here. This is budgetary. We are going to get into the budget in a minute.

I would like to proceed for the record so that the record does not get all cluttered up to go ahead and take action on the bill that is before us, then we will go into a discussion of the Park Service.

Mr. STENHOLM. Go ahead.

Mr. VOLKMER. Before I recognize the gentleman from Montana for a motion—first of all, I think it was even the first time the gentleman from Texas walked in. [Laughter.]

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move that we refer to the full committee H.R. 829 with the usual language as necessary.

Mr. VOLKMER. Any discussion on the motion?

[No response.]

Mr. VOLKMER. If there is no discussion, all in favor say aye.

[A chorus of ayes.]

Mr. VOLKMER. All opposed say no.

[No response.]

Mr. VOLKMER. The ayes have it. H.R. 829 will now be referred to the full committee for action.

At this time we will begin with the second item of this hearing, the budget. It would be just as well if you go ahead and answer Charlie's question so we all know what has been happening for years with the Texas State Forest Service.

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir, and thank you very much indeed, Congressman Stenholm.

Let me state first of all that we have no plans, and it is not part of our overall scheme and never has been, to turn over to the States the responsibility for fighting fires on Federal land. That

Digitized by Google

would remain a Federal responsibility, and always would be as far as we are concerned—in the immediate future at least for what I can speak of.

I do think that everything you have stated about the importance of cooperation is very true. We are very committed to it. We are greatly appreciative of the fact that people from Texas and all other States in fact willingly make their fire forces available for fire fighting outside of their States, and that you indicated that this benefits all the States because people came—as you said—from North Carolina and other places.

I think the second point that I should make is that when we do ask peeple to come in and help suppress fires outside of their States, whether it is on Federal land or on other properties that they are called into, particularly on the Federal lands, we compensate them for that. They are paid—their expenses are paid.

Of course it does mean that the States are encouraged and increasingly will have to have responsibility to build some fire-fighting infrastructure within their State. But the whole idea of that—the rationale, the theory, the basis of it, as you ask—is so that they can expect—other people will come in from other States when they have these catastrophic situations.

So I think that, really, we should all be encouraged by the way in which the U.S. Forest Service and the States that have cooperated over the past 4 or 5 years to build a phenomenally effective fire-fighting organization.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you.

Mr. Stenholm.

Mr. STENHOLM. Thank you.

As I mentioned earlier, the cooperation was tremendous. I could not say enough about the quality cooperation between the National Forest Service and the Texas Forest Service. It was tremendous.

What is the recommendation in the budget for Federal fire fighting? Is it up or down from where you were last year?

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir. In the initial budget that was set up by the administration in January, there was a request for about $10 million less than was appropriated in 1989 for grants to the States for the purposes of building their fire-fighting organizations.

Mr. STENHOLM. Was this because there was that much less need in 1989, or what was the rationale for making this request.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, sir, it is kind of building on a philosophy or basis of thinking over the past several years that the States really do have a responsibility to build organizations and infrastructure on their own basis, since it does enormously benefit them within their own States. Given the fact that Federal dollars are tight, this would be a lower priority than other expenditures.

But I think what I should also add is that there is a lot less in what we might call the Reagan budget proposal. Of course, since that was less than the fiscal year 1989 level, as we will get into in a minute as we discuss these things further, all of this is open for further discussion as we proceed with that actual fiscal year 1990 budget.

I think there is another point to it. I do not mean to prolong it. Part of the administration's proposal for fiscal year 1990 is to give a permanent solution to our fire fighting, fire suppression costs

Digitized by Google

problem by creating a permanent account. We will get into that a little bit more in detail.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Texas. I would like to proceed now, if we can, and then we will get into this issue in greater detail.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much you allowing me to get this statement in the record at this time.

My district had a tremendous wildfire. We appreciate so much the outstanding cooperation.

Mr. VOLKMER. We are going to be addressing this issue again as we did last year and the year before that, and I think that this is a little bit different from what is thought within the administration, and people on this subcommittee in regards to how to rank the priority of this function.

With that, go ahead with your prepared statement.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE S. DUNLOP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. DUNLOP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed we welcome the opportunity to appear before you and your committee, and appreciate the attention that all of your members have shown to the Forest Service budget.

Before Chief Robertson discusses the budget in detail, permit me, if I could, to explain very briefly some of the policy issues addressed in the administration's initial budget request in the revisions which affect the Forest Service.

President Bush submitted his budget revisions to the Congress on February 9, and these provisions included two aspects which could have a significant impact on the Forest Service program for fiscal year 1990.

First of all, as we were discussing previously with Congressman Stenholm, the President proposes to increase the request for fire fighting—actually, let me state that correctly. The President proposes to increase the request for acquisitions for recreation land or about $206 million for the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior. This matches the total appropriated amount by Congress for land acquisition in 1989. The Forest Service share for the 1989 appropriations is $64 million, and the allocation for such funds among the various land-management organizations for 1990 will be developed in consideration of overall priorities among potential parcels.

We are now coordinating with Interior and the Office of Management and Budget to establish a system to identify and prioritize such acquisitions.

The first change in the budget is this land acquisition account: $64 million for the Forest Service. The second aspect is that the remainder of the Forest Service budget is subject to the President's flexible freeze proposal. This proposal is intended to hold fiscal year 1990 outlays for a number of discretionary programs to the fiscal year 1989 outlay level. The distribution of appropriations among various programs and agencies is subject to negotiation with Congress, and about $136 billion is on the table.

Digitized by Google

Precisely what this means for the Forest Service budget is uncertain because it is completely open to negotiation. But I did want the committee to know that there is a range of about $150 to $200 million difference between the fiscal year 1989 level that was appropriated and the fiscal year 1990 accounts. The negotiations will then, of course, affect the eventual allocations.

All of us, of course, are too painfully aware that the overall deficit situation requires us to submit a budget which is below the amounts that were appropriated for fiscal year 1989. And while the revised budget permits this flexibility that I have discussed, there is still a need for restraint. Until such time as when the negotiations are completed, our instructions are that the initial budget proposal that was made will be controlling.

Mr. Chairman, my testimony goes into some detail about the request, the proposal for the National Forest System, for the research arm, and for the State and private forestry arm of the Forest Service, but what I would like to do would be just to submit that and maybe summarize by making a point that I wanted to mention earlier about this fire-fighting business.

The initial budget proposes a major improvement in funding for forest fire protection. A permanent indefinite appropriation would be established for fire protection, emergency suppression, and emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands. It would be financed from the general fund and off-set by deposits of timber and on-shore mineral receipts from the general fund. The amount of the deposit would be deducted, in our proposal, from total receipts prior to calculating payments to the States. This whole proposal in itself would provide an automatic dependable appropriation for meeting our fundamental responsibilities for protecting public safety and valuable natural resources.

Now, if I may, Mr. Chairman, as you know there are going to be a lot of transitions at the Department. There will be new Assistant Secretaries, and one thought that I wanted to leave with this committee pertains to this business about fighting fires, and how we deal with it, particularly in wilderness areas. All of us who are interested in improving the quality of our natural environment need to reflect upon these things in the months ahead.

One of the lessons we have been forcefully reminded of through the fires this past summer is that the potential force of fire is just awesome. It can lead to great costs in terms of resources destroyed and investments lost, and involves substantial direct costs for suppression as we have been discussing.

This suggests to me that we do need to pay careful attention to presuppression activities, including vegetative management in all areas. This applies to wilderness areas as well as areas managed for multiple uses. The designation of wilderness should not mean that we can ignore the fire. This raises the question of appropriateness of activities undertaken in wilderness and presuppression activities in particular.

We need in many ways to use a program of prescribed burning and presuppression to mitigate the wildfire threat to the wilderness areas, to adjacent lands, to nearby developments and other ownerships. In other cases it may be desirable to interrupt large

Digitized by Google

contiguous areas of heavy-fuel types to reduce the risk of uncontrollable fires.

In short, we all need to consider the degree to which we now impose restrictions in wilderness in fire fighting and fire suppression and presuppression activities, and whether more latitude in our practices would permit better protection of these extremely valuable resources.

I offer that to your committee for your review and consideration as you contemplate these things in the years ahead.

I would like to close, if I may, to take a moment to commend the Congress for actions that have permitted the Forest Service to improve its efficiency in its service to the public. You all have been very helpful in helping guide the Forest Service through some important changes, and we are appreciative of it.

In 1989, there was a change from a 1- to a 2-year fund availability for Forest Service funds, and this is very important. It allows better project planning and implementation and flexibility to deal with the natural vagaries of fire and weather. Second, congressional support for the pilot project the Chief is undertaking to simplify the budget structure. As part of this procedure, budgets were allocated to the pilot test forests by appropriation totals and a set of targets rather than by detailed line item funds within each appropriation. The results so far look very promising for the Forest Service.

It already has provided a means to stretch these limited Federal dollars and to expand opportunities for increased public use and enjoyment of the lands managed by the Forest Service.

The project also reflects Forest Service progress in implementing improved accounting systems. It reduces the need to come back to Congress for numerous minor adjustments with consolidated budget line items. Further, the Timber Sale Program Information Reporting System or TSPIRS, a detailed timber sale cost accounting system, will give the Congress and the executive branch a better basis for making funding decisions.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, these efforts that have been undertaken over the past several years need your continuing support, and speaking for myself I commend you and the committee for your past support of these activities.

I also believe it is important that the record show that the Forest Service has over the past decade, even with budget restraints, achieved record levels of output in significantly expanded public service in every regard. This has been done with 28 percent fewer employees in fiscal year 1988 than we had in fiscal year 1979, and with funding levels that are 13 percent lower in real terms in fiscal year 1988 compared to 1979.

Actions taken to bring about this dramatic increase in efficiency includes undertaking a number of special preductivity studies and teams, installing a modern computer system throughout the Forest Service, and sharing administrative services among various organizations.

The Forest Service has undertaken bold initiatives designed to encourage individuals closest to the on-the-ground resources to be innovative, to think on their own thereby reducing dependency on heavy layers of middle management.

96-470 O - 89 - 2

Digitized by Google

Again, congressional support and encouragement for this approach has been helpful, and is something we appreciate very much.

Before I conclude and turn over to Chief Robertson, I would like to say that my years of working with the Forest Service have been a pleasure. I appreciate the courtesies and the constructive working relationships that this committee has extended to me personally and to the Secretary of Agriculture, and that also includes your staff.

You and the Forest Service are engaged, in my judgment, in important undertakings and purposes, and I trust that with your help the Forest Service will continue to provide outstanding service to the Nation.

So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and extend my greatest respects to you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Dunlop appears at the conclusion of the hearing.]

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much, Mr. Dunlop.

Chief Robertson.

STATEMENT OF F. DALE ROBERTSON, CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, again I think Assistant Secretary Dunlop has hit the key points that are reflected in our budget. I think I will just enter my statement in the record and go directly to questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Robertson appears at the conclusion of the hearing.]

Mr. VOLKMER. OK.

I recognize the gentleman from Washington for any questions that he may have.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will start by stating my appreciation for your service and your kind words for us at this time. That is very positive.

There are always some concerns, I guess. The first concern I have, Chief, is the proposed timber sale program, 11.35 billion board feet.

I guess the fundamental question for this subcommittee is that sustainable? Is that set for future years in mind with the fiscal year ahead of us?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we just completed a record 2 years of timber harvest on the national forests. Last year we had an 11.6 billion board feet harvest and 12.6 or 12.7 the previous year.

So, with the timber sales under contract right now, the Forest Service is at an almost all-time low of about 22 billion board feet, and that is less than 2 years of timber harvest under contract.

So, we anticipate that harvest again in 1989 will exceed what we have put on the market, so that will go down further.

Now this 11.35 offer that we have in our budget is not sustainable in the future. We used some of the excess timber receipts we got last year in order to boost the 1990 program to 11.35, and it is only sustainable at about 11 billion in the out-years.

Digitized by Google

Mr. MORRISON. Does that coincide with forest plans as they are growing together?

Mr. LEONARD. Mr. Morrison, I might add there that when the Chief says it is not sustainable, it is not sustainable in terms of the Forest Service advanced preparation work.

The actual level is within the levels that we anticipate will have in our upcoming forest plans, so from the standpoint of our ability to sustain that level of growth out in perpetuity these levels are sustainable.

Our problem is in terms of the amount of sales preparation work.

Mr. MORRISON. So it is the bureaucracy which is the limiting factor, not the growth of the forests?

Mr. LEONARD. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON. So, it is the accumulation—the total on the sales—excuse me, on the planning packages as they come together across the Nation will be somewhere in this vicinity?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. They will be above the 11.3.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you.

A question on the unobligated land acquisition fund. There is an attempt to transfer $55 million of those to the National Forest System to cover the fire costs. Is that still the intent—and some of us are concerned about that because we made some amendments on land acquisition? I wondered how that ties in with the new administration's request to expand on that.

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir. As we speak now that is the intent, but it is under review.

The actual transfer of those funds has not taken place from the land acquisition accounts to the fire-suppression accounts.

But as we now stand, that would proceed very frankly because we have to have the funds to fight the fire and there is no immediate availability of funds to do that except from that account.

Now the good news is that we have a plan so that this will not recur in future years—the permanent fund. The other aspects include the supplemental appropriation requests that we have for fiscal year 1989.

But as we now speak, I would expect that probably we would continue to take those funds from land acquisition. But it is under review.

Mr. MORRISON. I think some of us have some concerns about your plan to get those funds. We would love to work with you to find the right answer. I am not sure you are on the right path, but I, No. 1, concur and congratulate you on surviving the most difficult of fire seasons.

Also I should congratulate you on how innovative you have been on where you have reached to get money to cover these fire fighting costs when I do not think you have had the support through OMB that you really needed to cover these costs.

Without being too critical allow me to say that we would like to work with you on finding some sort of opportunity so that you get money in the bank, and would not have to borrow a variety of different funds to actually subvert the use the mishandling of those funds as you take on responsibility for firefighters.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Virginia.

Digitized by Google

Mr. OLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask Chief Robertson a little bit more detail about this subject of a change in the handling of funds to fight fires and to suppress fires.

Is it true that due to the gross timber receipts which amounts to, if I am reading it right here, you believe these 1990 estimates to be $1 billion.

Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. And running somewhere between 869.8—in that range.

And you are going to deduct from that an amount that is—what numbers do you have; $300 million? How do you determine how much you deduct for the purpose of fighting fires?

Mr. ROBERTSON. As in the past, this budget has a proposal, I believe, for $382 million for fire fighting for the Forest Service, and that includes both emergency fire fighting as well as our regular fire prevention and our fire presuppression.

So the proposal is that we take that out of the timber and mineral receipts.

Now this fire fighting——

Mr. OLIN. It is mostly timber. Mineral is pretty small.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, this is the combined fire-fighting account for the Department of the Interior agencies and the Forest Service, and so we are tapping into the mineral receipts from the Department of the Interior. I think probably that minerals are contributing as much or little more than timber.

Mr. OLIN. You are going to have to allocate a portion of that to the national forest accounts. Is that right?

What I am trying to get at ultimately here is what is the effect going to be on the amount of money you have over the years you have been paying annually to the counties and that have national forest? That calculation comes off of the timber sales of the national forest. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct; $64 million, and that is about 18.4 percent of the receipts that would normally go to counties.

Mr. OLIN. What was $64 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, due to this fire-fighting fund it will reduce receipts to the counties, about $64 million from the Forest Service now, not the Interior.

And that is due to the proposal that we pay for fire-fighting funds out of gross receipts before the county gets their 25-percent share rather than out of net receipts, which would be——

Mr. OLIN. That 25-percent share has been running, let us say, 225 million, or something like that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Last year it was about $300 million, I believe; 1988 was $328 million.

Mr. OLIN. That is about a 20-percent reduction?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe it is 18.4, if my calculations are right.

Mr. OLIN. OK. Now this gross fire-fighting thing would come out of the BLM as well as the national forest?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. OLIN. It would be allocated, I take it, according to the acreage and also to the—it would be allocated by the timber sales and the mineral receipts?

Digitized by Google

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. So, the bulk of the money would fall on BLM, I take it, under this proposal?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, as I mentioned, it comes out of Interior minerals and timber receipts, which would be BLM, and our timber receipts and mineral receipts, and as it comes out it is close to about 50–50 receipts between the two departments.

Now I have a sheet of paper here, Congressman Olin, that shows the amount of receipts by timber and minerals from Interior, USDA and how that would effect payments to counties, and I can submit this for the record.

Mr. OLIN. If he could, Mr. Chairman, could he submit this paper which shows the detail of the timber receipts and mineral receipts?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes. Perhaps we can make copies for all of the members.

Mr. OLIN. That would be helpful.

I wanted to ask you, though, do you plan to set up a reserve fund then for fire-fighting purposes of some magnitude?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. What we would propose to do——

Mr. OLIN. That would be sort of in the nature of a trust fund, as it were?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We would, as part of our regular budget process give the Congress an estimate of how much money we think we are going to need for the following summer, or following year, and then that would be set aside as a permanent, indefinite appropriation coming out of receipts.

Mr. OLIN. And how would you replenish that fund, year by year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, it would come out of receipts. We have always got receipts coming into the Federal Treasury, and if we do not need all that we set aside in the beginning, then we will return money back to the Treasury. If we overspend, like we would have this last year, then we will make it up out of next year's receipts to compensate for the——

Mr. OLIN. The amount of money you are appropriating each year would depend upon your actual experience in the past year. You do not have any trust funds built up at this point. You are starting from zero, so I presume you are going to appropriate what you might think would be an average situation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. And then in the future, and you have a bad year—and this is going to fluctuate, and the effect on the counties that have been receiving some revenue here would be that the bigger the pie, the less their revenue?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. OLIN. In subsequent years. That is the way it would work?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. And you really do not have a plan that would set up some kind of a reserve fund that could be replenished on some kind of a steady basis. You put in a year's worth every year and there would be enough reserve to take care of the ups and downs. That is not your concept?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. It is not to set up a trust fund.

Digitized by Google

Mr. OLIN. In the past, I think you—is it true you have handled these ups and downs through the timber sales betterment program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. You have had a reserve, though, up there that has given you some ability to level out the fire-fighting costs?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That worked great up until this year, and because of the huge cost of $413 million last year fire fighting we depleted this KV fund.

Mr. OLIN. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this thing does need to be subject to considerable thought. We are going to get an awful reaction from the counties; I can tell you that. Suddenly they are going to have to pay for forest fires someplace, particularly those counties that do not anticipate—that do not happen to be unfortunate not to have forest fires—maybe that might be the case year after year.

I think that this is going to be very hard for the rural areas to take, frankly, very, very hard. I would hate to go out and say this small amount of revenue which, to them, is significant. It is going to be because of some accounting change suddenly—not only reduced by 20 percent but subject to annual ups and downs which would be totally at random.

That is no way a municipality likes to plan its future, and I have counties that have one-third to one-half national forests. They have a very low tax base as it is, and this is going to be making it lower.

So I think this aspect, Mr. Chairman, is going to need a lot of attention. I do not know that it is going to fall on very receptive ears.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would just like to add, Congressman Olin, we have a serious problem. Somehow we have got to deal with this fire fighting.

Mr. OLIN. There needs to be some kind of fund that can take care of the ups and downs in the acts of nature. That is quite obvious.

But should it be that money? That is the question. You have selected timber sales which have always been, over the years, been disposed of 25 percent to the counties and 75 percent to the general, and you have decided that you are going to change that. There are other ways you can do it—is all I am suggesting. And maybe you ought to look at a few.

I think this is going to fall on some very deaf ears. That is my opinion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Before we proceed for the next member's questions, Mr. Dunlop, do you make submissions on the budget? You make up your own and then submit them to OMB. Is that correct in the budgetary process.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well sir, that is part of the process. Of course the agencies make a request or recommendation to the Office of the Secretary, then in the Office of the Secretary it gets further massaged, and the bigger picture is included, and then we ship it over to OMB and they have a bigger perspective even than us, and so they massage it a little bit more, then what comes back is the administration's budget.

Digitized by Google

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Do you have a copy of what the agency submitted to OMB with you.

Mr. DUNLOP. You mean the Department?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, the Department's submission.

I would like to have that so when we look at all of this stuff we have something to look at as far as what you needed, where you needed it, what you were thinking before it went to OMB, and they changed some things.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir, we will give you——

Mr. DUNLOP. We have both what the Forest Service recommended to my office, and then what the Department recommended to OMB——

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, I would like that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And then passed back.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Tim, did you get that?

With that we will go to the gentleman from South Dakota for questioning.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if you might elaborate on the additional $9 million derived from expanded recreation-user charges and the legislation to expand user fees, you indicate, soon to be submitted to Congress? I wonder if you might elaborate to us what this involves.

Mr. DUNLOP. For a number of years, at least since I have been aboard since 1986, the administration has sought and expanded authority to collect user fees on a very limited basis in areas where there are specific services provided.

In other words, if there is a campground or other facilities like a boat ramp where we have had to make a capital investment or otherwise engage in capital costs, we would like to have authority to collect fees commensurate with that value. We have submitted that in the past, and would very much like to think about that as part of the budget in the future.

I should say, sir, that if that concept is widely supported by recreation organizations and conservation people, they feel that they would like to come to the table of these budget considerations with a contribution so that we can justify a fine level of recreation activity.

Mr. JOHNSON. Essentially the same program that has been brought here in the past.

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. All right.

One other question; you note that, except for cooperative pest surveys and funding to Minnesota for intensive management associated with the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, financial assistance to the States would be discontinued in the State and private forestry category, as well as termination of the forest management and utilization program.

How much money was in the current fiscal year for financial assistance to the States? Would you refresh my memory on that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, our total appropriation for fiscal year 1989 was $86.7 million. Historically, and I suspect is true for 1989, about

Digitized by Google

50 percent of that goes to the States in financial assistance; that would be around $43 to $45 million.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is there any recommendation to the States on how they are supposed to make up the difference here or simply "it is your problem now"?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The intent is that the States and the private landowners look at their priorities. If it is important to put in forestry that the States then would decide how much money they would put into the States or into forestry and whether they wanted to make up all or part of this.

Mr. DUNLOP. Congressman, I might say, following up on a point the chairman brought up a minute ago, that it is important to the Forest Service and the programs that they have with the States that they have good relations with them.

I think that this is an example of one of the cases where the Office of the Secretary would intervene and say "look, we would really like, all things considered, to be able to continue this type of financial assistance, but frankly in the constrained budget environment we cannot afford that. Since there is a substantial benefit in local areas for these types of activities, maybe the States ought to take that responsibility and we will concentrate our particular contribution in this area to research, technology, and things that are not practical to be done at the State level."

So, that is the rationale, and I think rather than to have the Chief defend that in every detail I will take responsibility for that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from California.

Mr. HERGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chief Robertson, I would like to ask about sustainable yield. It is a very touchy issue certainly in many of our areas. I do not think any prudent person would want to harvest beyond what is sustainable.

I believe that we have pretty much clarified something that you said earlier, but you did make a statement that right now we were cutting at a greater—if I understood it correctly—at a greater degree than what was sustainable, and I noticed that our press was writing all of that down. I believe it was clarified that we did not mean we were cutting down more than what is sustainable, but I did not notice them writing it down at that time.

I would just like you to clarify that again, and my question is to what degree could we cut and be sustainable? What are we cutting now? What could we be cutting? Are we cutting below that amount that we are able to sustain or not? Could you just clarify that please?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Thank you for the opportunity to clarify that because I gave a very narrow answer that was restrictive to the budget.

As far as the land-management plans and what a sustained board level of timber that we can sustain over time, although we are still finalizing them in Oregon, Washington, and California, I believe that we will come out somewhere between 11 and 12 billion board feet. We can sustain this level from a forest plan and a biological standpoint.

Digitized by Google

In my answer to that question, I was looking at the budget. The timber sales have to be in the pipeline for 4 or 5 years before they are ready to be offered on the market. Primarily because of appeals, lawsuits, and lost work previously done on timber sales by having to pull out of them and not put them on the market, as well as some interruption from fires the last 2 or 3 years, the pipeline for timber sales—advanced timber sale preparation—is way down. The context of my answer is this; the fiscal year budget is not adequate to complete the advanced timber sale preparation to build the pipeline back up so we may sustain 11.35 billion over the next 2 to 3 to 4 years.

Mr. HERGER. Thank you.

Do you have any numbers of what, biologically, we could cut and still be sustainable if we had the budget to do so?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are still trying to finalize the land-management plans in your area in northern California and Oregon and Washington. The rest of them are pretty well completed. I think we are going to come out somewhere around 11.5 to 12 billion; however, there are still the big timber areas of California, Oregon, and Washington as yet to be determined.

Mr. HERGER. Chief, that would be sustainable for 100 years. Is that right?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. DUNLOP. Forever. We operate on a 100-year rotation.

Mr. HERGER. Is it not true that we can cut quite a bit more than that and still be sustainable? Are we about at the point that——

Mr. ROBERTSON. It varies by section of the country. In northern California, Oregon and Washington we have been operating pretty much up at the maximum level under the old plans, and there is not a lot of room to expand in addition to that.

Now we have other parts of the country, for example the Lakes States, we have been cutting way below what the sustainable level was just because the markets were not there. So we can expand in certain areas.

But California, Oregon, and Washington have been operating right up almost to the old plan level, which is the sustained year level.

Mr. LEONARD. I might just add there that this is based on what we think is a balanced multiple-use program for that forest with full protection for viable wildlife, recreation, and other programs.

If you were simply to look at those forests, and at how much trees could you grow without paying a lot of attention to recreation values and whatnot, then the capabilities are much greater. If you managed them strictly as a tree farm and just meeting the minimum requirements for water and air quality, the biological potential to grow wood is greater.

But we are managing these forests in the multiple-use context, and as such, the 11 or 12 billion board foot range the Chief cited does, in fact, describe the biological potential of those forests.

Mr. HERGER. Thank you very much.

I see my time is up. One just quick comment.

It seems like each year we have a budget that would reduce our 25 percent growth allowance that goes to our local communities. I wish we would stop doing this. Every year we beat it back, but we

Digitized by Google

have to fight this battle in our local communities. I am sure you are aware of how much trouble we are having here in Washington. They are having more problems in the local communities.

In California in our rural communities alone if we do what you propose our communities would receive almost $14 million less for their schools and their roads, and I really think we should begin looking somewhere else as a source for this funding, particularly when we are making money off harvesting our local communities, not losing money.

Mr. DUNLOP. Your remarks are well taken, Congressman. We understand. I think that the rationale has always been that you pay your dividends on the net rather than on the gross. If a private firm gave its dividends out on its gross sales, it would be bankrupt.

So that is the theory, and there are these other factors that you have described. The importance of a wood fiber to a national economy, the macroeconomy you might say, the housing construction nationwide or anything else, the cost of that infrastructure that is necessary to get those trees to that marketplace.

These other factors that you have mentioned are things that are certainly important and are under consideration in the budget that is being considered by the Congress. The Bush administration in the conferences that are taking place would be very mindful of what you have said.

Mr. HERGER. Thank you.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you very much.

The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What are the anticipated revenues in 1990 Forest Service, Chief?

Mr. ROBERTSON. $1.7 billion.

Mr. HARRIS. That is total revenue?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. All right. Now, we had $2.7 billion appropriated in 1989, and you are asking for $2.5 billion for 1990?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Excuse me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The net costs of running the Forest Service we anticipate to be about $800 million.

Mr. HARRIS. Now I had understood the flexible freeze was 1989 adjusted for inflation. If 1989 was $2.7, then it is adjusted the wrong way. It ends up at $2.5 billion, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe the idea——

Mr. HARRIS. Do you have a different definition? Your understanding?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is my understanding the flexible freeze would not—the $136 billion that is in the flexible freeze—does not include inflation. In other words, it is actual money outlaid in 1989.

Mr. HARRIS. All right. You mean part of it is flexible and some of it is inflexible? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was not increased for inflation.

Mr. HARRIS. The flexible freeze, at least as I understood the definition of 1989 adjustment for inflation—some of it is and some of it is not from what you are proposing?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, there are two things going on here. We have the Forest Service budget which you have which was submit-

Digitized by Google

ted by the Reagan administration, and you will see columns in there of base.

Mr. HARRIS. This is much better, I will agree about that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The base column does not start with 1989 dollars and incorporate inflation. The flexible freeze by the Bush administration goes back to actual dollars outlayed in 1989 without inflation.

Mr. HARRIS. I have seen estimates as high as $30 million saved by the Federal Government last year because of the use of States for fire fighting. Do you agree that it was a large savings to the Federal Government that could have been given to the States to fight the fires?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Would you agree that the figure is as high as 32? Would you have access to some information?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not have any better figure, but it is many, many millions of dollars I would say.

Mr. LEONARD. I might say that we had crews from 39 different States on the Yellowstone area fires. If we had not had those crews, there were no alternatives except to bring in additional military.

The difference was that while the help we got from the military was invaluable it was—people who had 2 days of training before they came out of the military base to the fire; whereas, the crews we got from the States were long-time professional fire fighters organized into efficient crews with proper overhead.

I think the savings we got from the use of those State crews were miscalculated; I think—it was $30 million——

Mr. HARRIS. And we are agreed that you cannot keep the capability, whether it be the States or the Feds—geared up to what we have had in the last 3 years—that is a very costly thing in and of itself, would it not?

Mr. LEONARD. It would not make any sense for an organization to develop the capability for dealing with the worst case. The idea of mutual aid moving back and forth is legitimate for the local towns with their adjacent towns; it is legitimate for States.

It also provides opportunities for State crews. For example, a State may go for several years without any significant fire problems on that State's area of jurisdiction, so by allowing them to move around the country they can get experiences and maintain their capabilities much greater than they would otherwise.

So I think everybody benefits by that interchange of people back and forth. The issue is really how you fund that type of a capability.

Mr. HARRIS. And the real issue here, I guess as far as we are concerned, is just what kind of signals do we send to the States when recognizing that they saved the Government a lot of money last year if we are talking about cutting funding for the fire protection and fire fighting, and we may not have that ability the next round.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Excuse me. I did not mean to cut you off.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was just going to point out that I think Assistant Secretary Dunlop's testimony said the Forest Service had reduced our personnel by about 28 percent since 1979, and a lot of

Digitized by Google

that came from our fire crews. The reason we could make that adjustment in our fire crews was because in emergency situations and bad fire years, we have been able to pull in so many well-trained State crews, and that is one of the things that has helped us reduce people in the Forest Service.

Mr. HARRIS. And we want to help you. We just do not want our funds cut.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you.

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chief, could you tell me the cost of the budget as to the timber receipts, which is a different function of the budget?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are you talking about 1989?

Mr. SMITH. Right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Our anticipated receipts in 1989 is about $1 billion on regular national forest land, O&C lands in Oregon is another $24 million, and salvage sales would be about another $50 to $75 million.

So we are looking at between $1 billion and $1.1 billion.

Mr. SMITH. And the costs?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The costs of the total timber sale program are approximately $519 million.

So it runs about 50 percent of the anticipated revenues.

Mr. SMITH. Well the point is that all you have to do is manage timber if you make $500 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Let us talk about this receipt thing. We do not have to talk about this long because it is not going to last long.

Interior Committee has already made its recommendation that this method of funding fires is not going to wash. This committee has made that recommendation already that this dog will not hunt, and that leaves us with the alternatives of finding the measures to assist with this firefighting fund, and what the gentleman from Virginia has mentioned is a reserve fund of some sort.

As you know several of us are working on a program like that, so I would like to extend to you my outreached hand simply to ask you to give us some alternatives. This is not going to work. We are not going to pass this program so we are going to need another method of funding for firefighting in this country, and I am asking you to bring us some alternatives.

Now I know you are bound to try to protect this part of the budget, but you are not bound when I ask you to give us some alternatives that we can use to help fund this fire-fighting program. I appreciate it if you would do that.

Just in passing, Mr. Dunlop, you know very well that large portions of the West are owned by the Federal Government—52 percent of Oregon—in some cases, 78 percent of the counties. This has nothing to do with the comparisons to a business net or gross. This has to do, as you well know, with the Federal Government's requirement that they pay property taxes on the land that they own in the West. A 25-percent ratio is close to what should be paid in property taxes.

Digitized by Google

So the question of paying it out at net or gress is not an issue. If you do not pay your property taxes, somebody else pays it, and in this case, of course, the huge burden lies in the West where the timber is in this country and in other parts of this country, as well, so you are shifting property taxes in this kind of proposal. It is not a question of gross or net. We have talked about that. You do not have to answer.

Now, I am interested in the reduction proposed in this budget of some 150 million board feet that will be off-sale in 1990 when I also noted that we are marketing about 1 billion more board feet a year than we are actually selling.

Now how long can we continue to operate in a manner when when we have the budget for the fiscal year when we are selling more than what is in the budget?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, for optimum conditions it would probably be good for the timber industry to have a timber supply from 2 to 3 years under contract. That removes a lot of uncertainty and permits good planning on their part.

Right now, because we have, as you pointed out, been harvesting about 1 billion board feet for the last couple of years more than we have put on the market we are down to about 22 billion board feet under contract. That represents, I think, about 1.8 years.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask you another way.

You said this budget was not adequate to take care of the harvest anticipated. What would be adequate? What is the number?

Mr. ROBERTSON. What I said was that this budget proposes 11.35 billion board foot timber sale program in 1990. In order to get there we have put all of the excess receipts that the Congress gave us last year from the timber sales into advanced timber sale preparation of 22 million. The idea was to rebuild the pipeline.

We have taken that 22 million and pumped it into the 1990 program in order to get it up to 11.35. There is not money built into this budget to continue 11.35 billion board feet out in 1991, 1992, and 1993.

Mr. SMITH. Let us not be defensive about it. I know you have to protect the budget.

What would be adequate, in your opinion, to conduct a program in the Forest Service that would adequately harvest what you anticipate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. About $60 to $70 million to refill the pipeline that has been drained over the last several years due to the problems we have had.

Mr. SMITH. I appreciate that because as you know we are here, despite what you think, to try to help you.

Oue quick other point, if I may Mr. Chairman, I need to ask about the spotted owl because, of course, it is on our minds; it is on the endangered species list. It is half of the timber harvest of the Northwest, and I note as I mentioned to you before that there is a reduction in the budget for research on the spotted owl of $195,000. How can we be reducing the budget for research on the spotted owl when it may devastate the timber industry in the West, No. 1, and No. 2, I want to know if you are going to rely on the Fish and Wildlife Service for an analysis of the spotted owl, how he mates, how far in ranges as such?

Digitized by Google

Mr. ROBERTSON. We are doing that research primarily in the Forest Service and cooperating with Fish and Wildlife. But we are doing the bulk of the research on it.

Mr. SMITH. All right.

Now, a question about the budget; $195,000 down on this budget. The question is how can we be reducing the budget on the spotted owl when at this time it is probably one of the most important issues facing this country in respect to the natural harvest of timber we have had in the past few years?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, it is hard-nosed priorities. It is a high priority, as you point out. The 1989 budget was significantly increased, so it reduced the 1989 budget which was up by $195 million.

Mr. SMITH. That is not the answer I was seeking, Chief.

Let me ask you another way. If we determined that there are necessary funds to adequately research the spotted owl, can you find funds in other parts of the budget to do that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. We have funds for inventory and other essential work in the National Forest System.

Mr. SMITH. Well, all I want to ask you is are you satisfied with recommending this budget with respect to the spotted owl, that you can do adequate research in this area without being pinched by a reduction of $195,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We can do adequate research. There is additional research we can do but this reflects some tough priorities.

Mr. LEONARD. If I can just add, we have developed a 5-year research and development program designed to provide some essential answers on the spotted owl habitat needs at the end of that 5-year period. That is a key to our strategy for dealing with the spotted owl. The decision which is causing so much concern out in the Northwest lays out the Forest Service procedures for dealing with the spotted owl.

It provides that at the end of 5 years we will review the status of the owl and what we understand at that time, and then make any necessary adjustments.

The level of budget that we have in this request will keep us on track to complete that program at the end of 5 years.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would hope that on discussion with you and this committee might recommend the budget with the kind of increases that the Forest Service has mentioned as necessary in the harvesting of timber.

And also I would like to make sure, Mr. Chairman, that they bring us some alternatives on this forest fire fighting, and how we can assist them in setting up a reserve fund of some sort out of the timber receipts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Oregon. It is contemplated by the chairman and the ranking minority member, that following this hearing we will have a meeting of the subcommittee for those who are interested, and prepare a letter similar to the letter that was sent last year to the Appropriation Budget Committee as to what we think about certain aspects of the budget and why things maybe should be adjusted.

Digitized by Google

But we are planning to do that. That is one of the purposes of the hearing here today.

I would also like to announce that while we have some of the members here—I forgot to do it originally—that in 2 weeks we are planning to hold a hearing on the gentleman from California's bill.

With that I will recognize the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JONTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, gentlemen.

Chief, I want to ask you a couple of questions about below cost timber sales.

This last December you released the first report using the new timber sale accounting system. Good news, national forest users. The new accounting system shows receipts exceed costs by $540 million during fiscal year 1987.

My study of the figures indicates that in fact 94 percent of the net timber receipts came from our forests in Oregon, Washington, and California. I wonder whether maybe a better statement in the timber sale program and report here would have been good news from Oregon, Washington, and California, and bad news from just about everywhere else.

Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We obviously make the most money in Oregon, Washington, and California, but there are other areas as well. I believe Indiana is a plus State as well as several of the southern States have a profit.

Mr. JONTZ. Well let me read to you from the 1987 Timber Receipts and Expenditures report from the Timber Sale Program Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1987. Region 1, 12 of 13 forests below cost; Region 2, 11 of 12 forests below cost; Region 4, 15 of 16 forests below cost; Region 9, 13 of 14 below cost; then Alaska, 2 out of 2 below cost.

[The material follows:]

Digitized by Google

1987 TIMBER RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS, BY REGION*

National Forest Region	Timber Receipts	Timber Expenditures	Net Timber Receipts	Ratio of Timber Receipts to Expenditures	Number of Forests Below-Cost	Harvest Volume (Millions of Board Feet)
	---- (Thousands of Dollars) ----					
Northern (1)	68,986.0	95,358.9	-26,372.9	0.72	12 of 13	1,105.9
Rocky Mountain (2)	11,714.0	24,358.3	-12,644.3	0.48	11 of 12	426.8
Southwestern (3)	33,189.0	30,840.2	2,348.8	1.08	7 of 11	496.7
Intermountain (4)	16,048.0	32,334.7	-16,286.7	0.50	15 of 16	463.6
Pacific SW (5)	239,546.0	171,783.4	67,762.6	1.39	6 of 18	2,011.2
Pacific NW (6)	740,100.0	463,885.1	276,214.9	1.60	2 of 19	5,597.3
Southern (8)	109,533.0	99,534.9	9,998.1	1.10	8 of 15	1,424.0
Eastern (9)	29,514.0	44,276.0	-14,762.0	0.67	13 of 14	851.7
Alaska (10)	5,936.0	24,708.4	-18,772.4	0.24	2 of 2	336.4

SOURCE: USDA, Forest Service, *Timber Sale Program Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1987 Test, National Summary*. Timber expenditures include payments to states.

Digitized by Google

Mr. JONTZ. In fact, is it not correct, Chief, that in 75 forests nearly two-thirds were losing money on our timber sales?

Mr. ROBERTSON. About 57 percent of our forests were in a below-cost situation.

Mr. JONTZ. Well, I want to ask you to reconcile that with the information on this particular table that I have from your report. In fact, according to my addition from this table when I look region by region and add up net timber receipts—and again this is from Timber Sale Program Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1987, National Summary. I show that, in fact, net timber receipts were $267 million.

Now which set of figures is correct? How do you reconcile that with the letter the National Forest Users, which shows that the net receipts were $540 million? That is a two-fold difference in net receipts as reported in two separate Forest Service documents using the same accounting system. Are you sharing accountants with the Federal Savings and Loan people? I do not understand how there can be such a big discrepancy between the two.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not know where you are getting your number. Our revenues show $1,255,000,000 in 1987. Now, you are reporting 260 something?

Mr. JONTZ. Yes. When I add up the figures, it is about 267. I will share with you this table which shows Net Timber receipts Region 1 is a negative, $26 million, Region 2 is a negative, $13 million roughly, maybe a couple of million dollars in Region 3. I want to give you these figures.

Chief, I guess the point that I want to make is that in fact we do have a below-cost timber sales problem. I think that budgetary concerns require that we address this problem in a responsible way, and we cannot, in the Congress, really begin to understand the problem until you give us a true and reliable accounting of the costs and revenues. I hope, at least for the record today, that you can provide us with an explanation of the discrepancies between two different Forest Service documents, and also provide a forest-by-forest summary of the receipts, expenditures, and harvest-volume data that would split out payments to the States in reporting the net timber sales receipts data.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I found your—is it $267,486,000?

Mr. JONTZ. Yes. About 266,947.

Mr. ROBERTSON. OK. To answer your question, we showed a net profit of $540 million on the timber sale program in fiscal year 1987. If you deduct from that the payments to the States and the counties of $272 million, you then end up with a net gain going to the U.S. Treasury of $267 million.

Mr. JONTZ. I appreciate that clarification. I would still appreciate a forest-by-forest summary because I think it will show that on the bulk of the forests in our system—certainly in many of the regions of the Forest Service—that we have a very serious problem with below costs timber sales.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can give you a summary of that. There are 16—and again, we are looking at 1987—there are 69 forests that were in a below-cost situation. They produced 20 percent of the timber.

96-470 O - 89 - 3

Digitized by Google

So even though it is 57 percent of the forests, those forests produced only 20 percent of the timber. The net loss on those forests was $50 million.

Mr. JONTZ. If I might ask you one additional question, I also have with me this morning some pages from the USDA 1990 budget explanatory notes from the Committee on Appropriations relating to the Forest Service. I am turning to the pages that relate to the Forest Resource Management Program to provide assistance through the States to private landowners.

Basically this report takes three pages to discuss the merits of this particular program, so far as economic development, resource protection, water quality improvement, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Then after reading three pages about the merits of this program, on the fourth page comes the budget recommendations which, as I understand it, is to zero-out the program.

I appreciate the fact that Secretary Dunlop addressed this earlier, but given the fact, so far as hardwood production in this country goes, 90 percent of our hardwoods come from private lands, and only 10 percent comes from public lands. I appreciate the fact the priorities have to be established, but why is not increasing production on our private lands a priority when you look at the timber needs in our country?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is very, very high priority. The question is who pays for it?

Mr. JONTZ. Is it not a better investment for the Federal Government to spend that $5 million on increasing productivity on those particular lands? I see here in terms of the budget summary that the budget proposes—just to take one example—$4.6 million increase in the Tongass Timber Supply Fund. And I question whether the benefits, in terms of meeting the timber needs of this country will be furthered more by increasing the Tongass Timber Supply Fund by $4.6 million or they will be by spending that same amount of money in producing more on the private woodlands that are already so critical in meeting the hardwood needs of this Nation.

Could you explain that? Do you believe that spending the $5 million on the Tongass Timber Supply Fund is going to get us more timber supply in this country than what it is going to be if it were spent on the private lands through the Forest Resource Management Program?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Probably not, but we did not just wake up this morning and start over. We have 40 years of history in Alaska; we are carrying out long-term contractual commitments and law that the Congress passed on how we ought to manage the Tongass National Forest.

We have to carry out our legal mandate and contractual commitments; therefore, those are not really on the table.

Mr. JONTZ. Well, I appreciate your response, but——

Mr. DUNLOP. Congressman, I wonder if I might add just a brief footnote. The remarks that you have made about managing the, what we call, the nonindustrial private forest lands are very well taken. It is a matter of very serious concern to the Department. We are acting on that.

Digitized by Google

I am chairman of what we call the Natural Resources and Environment Committee of the Secretary's Policy Coordination Council. We have established a private forestry work group. We have the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and other agencies that have a mandate to deal with private landowners working very intensely with this.

And with your permission, because of your interest, I would like to send you some of the materials that we have developed through those agencies, and particularly at the State level. States, in their State forestry program, are doing a fantastic job of improving the management—the quality of management of privately owned lands. Enormous opportunities there. You are exactly right.

Mr. JONTZ. My time has expired, and I appreciate the patience of the chairman, and thank you very much for your response.

Mr. HARRIS [acting chairman]. The gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. STALLINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Dunlop, how much money did the Forest Service give to the counties last year in both timber and mineral receipts? Is that on some of the documents we have been given here.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well, sir, the document that I had asked to have prepared and distributed actually did not give that money from last year. It was calculated on the basis of the current law, that is the existing current services activity. And that amount of money was calculated to be $364,400,000. That is the amount of money that would be distributed under the 1990 budget.

Mr. STALLINGS. Now that is for the Forest Service timber sales receipts and mineral receipts. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is total receipts to the Forest Service.

Mr. STALLINGS. OK.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The exact amount of what we paid out in 1988 was $293 million.

Mr. STALLINGS. And that was divided among all of the counties in the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. LEONARD. All of those counties with National Forest lands.

Mr. STALLINGS. Why is that? Why just the counties with forest lands?

Mr. LEONARD. The law that sets up the 25-percent fund provides for paying 25 percent of the receipts on a national forest to the counties with lands within that national forest. It is distributed on the basis of the acreage in the county within the national forest.

Mr. STALLINGS. What is the logic behind that, Mr. Leonard?

Mr. LEONARD. Essentially a payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. DUNLOP. And the administration proposed several years ago, I think back in 1981, 1982, or 1983 before my time, a legislative change that would permit the counties or the States to tax the Federal Government at the same rate they tax their local people. That was part of the budget's submissions, I think, in those years.

But that, likewise, was not regarded favorably and was not enacted.

Mr. STALLINGS. It seems to me that we have got a rather interesting thing taking place here. Obviously those monies were given to the local counties first of all because they did not have a very big

Digitized by Google

tax base, in many instances; second, with the Forest Service's presence there, whether it be timbering or whatever, it was assumed that those counties would need some help in taking care of their schools, maintaining their roads, fire and police protection.

Do you have a sense that that has changed in the ensuing years that those counties are in better shape now to handle those problems than they were 4 to 5 years ago.

Mr. DUNLOP. Congressman, I think the consideration that the administration has made in making this proposal is not based on that kind of analysis or calculation about the degree of the counties being in a better condition or in a worse condition today than they might have been before.

It is part of an ongoing philosophical question about what should be the level and how these payments in lieu of taxes should be calculated.

It is regarded by the Office of Management and Budget and by the Department that the benefit to the counties through these distributions is far greater than it would be if they used normal calculations which they tax people, other landowners in their jurisdictions.

And so it is just a basis of the Federal Government making the point "well why not treat us as a landowner like the American people the same way you would treat landowners in your own county?"

So it is really a philosophical thing. It is not based upon this type of economic analysis.

Mr. STALLINGS. But you see that is my point. I think that in the State of Idaho where two-thirds of the land is owned by the Federal Government, a big part of that by the Forest Service, that land will never be taxed, those counties, perhaps, for example the Lemhi County area that has very little private land. If the Forest Service is successful in doing this those people end up doing a disproportionate amount of fighting the fires, and yet the impact to that county would be devastating.

If you were to have a fire in the Salmon Forest, those communities would take a terrible beating during that fire year, and at the same time the revenues would be cut back severely, which would make it very difficult for those county officials to do their job.

I think this is a very insensitive proposal. I think that what we have, really, is sort of a double standard, that we go to those counties and say "this is national forest; those policies will be set for what is good for the Nation, not what is good for these particular communities, and by the way if there is a fire, you are going to pick up the lion's share of fighting it."

That does not make any sense at all. If that is going to be the case, then perhaps we ought to bring in those local counties in and say "all right, if you are going to give up so much of your resources to fight the fires, we will give you a disproportionate share in planning and what goes on in those forests as well."

This, to me, is perhaps the most unjust proposal. Our forests are used by people from all over the country. It seems to me that it would be very logical that people all over the country ought to pay not only for the maintenance and upkeep but for the fire suppressions as well. And to take this out of the funds of these counties,

Digitized by Google

these very small number of counties, as a matter of fact, to me is a very poor proposal.

Mr. DUNLOP. We understand the depth of your feeling and the logic, and I think it is well taken and I can assure you that as these things are worked out and negotiated through this 1990 negotiation process that they will weigh very strongly.

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Chairman, let me just pursue one other question if I can.

Forest Service policy recognizes the importance of national recreation areas by directing management toward their becoming showcases for use by the public. Again, my State is very fortunate and proud to have several NRA's, including the Sawtooth NRA in my congressional district.

Sawtooth NRA is a national treasure, and it attracts thousands of visitors each year. My concern is the level of funding for the Sawtooth NRA. In recent years there has been reduced funding of personnel.

If the Sawtooth NRA is to become one of the Forest Service showcase areas, do you believe that there has been inadequate funding in recent years, and while I recognize there are national budget constraints, would you please share with the subcommittee your professional views on whether their is adequate staffing of the Sawtooth NRA?

Now if you are unable to provide this information, I will take a response whenever I can get it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, I can answer in general.

We took a look at our NRA's last year, and we agree with your assessment that these are congressionally designated areas. They should be showcased on the national forest, and we have not put as much priority on those areas as we believe we should.

We took advantage of the excess timber sale receipts, about $73 million that the Congress included in our budget last year, in making NRA's top priority for those excess timber sale receipts going into recreation to bring them up to a standard that we are proud of.

Unfortunately, the NRA's in the past have been limping by on a minimum budget in recreation and trails, and fish and wildlife. They deserve more attention than the Forest Service has been giving them in the past, and we intend to put more priority on them.

Mr. STALLINGS. I think we would all be better served if in fact you did that, and finally—let me make this a statement as much as a question—several of my constituents have approached me about the fishing potentials on two sets of drainage systems in the Targhee and the Sawtooth—both are blessed with magnificent rivers. The South Fork and the Henry's Fork of the Snake River in the Targhee and in the headwaters of the Salmon River located in the Sawtooth National Forest.

Now the issue that has been raised is that neither national forest has a fisheries biologist. They have several other specialists, but it seems to me the primary focus of those two areas would be the fisheries, and perhaps we do not need as many timber specialists and other kinds of specialists if we can enhance the real strength of that area which obviously is the fishing.

Digitized by Google

I would be interested in your response sometime as to why we have no fisheries biologists working on either of those two forests or on any of those drainage systems.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, all I can say is that probably one of the fastest growing disciplines or professions in the Forest Service is fisheries biologists. We are hiring several of them this year, and we hired several last year.

Now about the distribution of those I do not know about the two forests that you are talking about. But I do know that several of the forests, like the Nez Perce National Forest, do have fisheries biologists in Idaho.

So it is a priority of ours, and we are moving as fast as we can to shore-up and put more priority on fisheries.

Mr. STALLINGS. One of the great things about this committee is that we always expect you to do things yesterday.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, and we have to balance the budget, too. I mean we only have so many dollars to deal with, and we make hard-nosed tough priority decisions that we do not even feel good about sometimes, but nevertheless that is reality. We have to do it.

Mr. STALLINGS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you.

Before I recognize the gentleman from Virginia for another question, I would just like to point out, Mr. Dunlop, I do not believe that we have heard one member of this subcommittee speaking affirmatively in regard to your plan for fighting forest fires in the future, as far as the funding mechanism is concerned, and I have to voice the same sentiment, and I too, along with Mr. Morrison and other members of this subcommittee, are interested in trying to work something out, and hopefully in the future we will be able to sit down and review alternative ways of doing it, because I have to agree with the gentleman from Oregon that this is not going to fly.

Mr. DUNLOP. Well sir, I understand, and I will take that message back, and of course your other message that we work with you on options, and indeed there are options.

I think the bottom line is that we have a mechanism that would allow some permanent reliable long-term funding.

Mr. VOLKMER. No question about it.

Mr. DUNLOP. We can work that out.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think we all agree on that.

Mr. DUNLOP. We appreciate your willingness to, at least to consider what was a valiant effort, perhaps, to address it, and we hope we can resolve it.

Mr. VOLKMER. At least we may be able to get to a starting point to discuss it anywhere.

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. OLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to ask the Chief one more question. First, I wanted to say that I am very pleased, in general, with the efforts of the Forest Service in the area of recreation. I think you have shown some new initiatives which seems to be very good and make a lot of sense.

Digitized by Google

There is one that I have a considerable question about, and I hope that you are not putting an awful lot of money into that in this budget which is tight, and this is the program that you have initiated in recent years—last couple of years—for all terrain vehicles and also highway vehicles for the purposes of making recreational trails that these vehicles can ride around on and have races and bump around and get that kind of enjoyment.

I have always felt that in some respects these motor vehicles are not really compatible with the growing of flora in the forest. They will tend to make trails that do not have anything growing on them. It is not really compatible with the idea of regenerating the forest.

When you get to the full-sized 4-wheel drive vehicles you almost have to build a road in order to have the vehicle to have a trail to drive on; 40-inchers are not so bad. You can snake them through the trees without any great amount of expense.

I hope that you are not pushing this program to the point where it is becoming a major financial obligation. Experience in the George Washington Forest, as you may know, has been varied. Some of these trails have worked out all right providing the clubs that use them are responsible. It is very clear that the Forest Service does not have enough man power to police them adequately themselves.

I hope that you proceed cautiously in this area, and I would be interested in any comments you could make on that subject and on whether or not the budget contains a significant amount of money for pushing that activity?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I would be happy to comment on that.

We do view off-road vehicle use as a legitimate use of the forest if it is done in the right place in the proper manner. There is very little money in this budget for off-road vehicle trails. The trails we have on the national forests are almost all built by the off-road vehicle clubs, and they do most of the work on not only building them but maintaining them.

Mr. OLIN. Do you allow them to come in with chain saws and bulldozers to build those trails?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do we what?

Mr. OLIN. Chain saws and bulldozers to build those trails?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, that might happen sometimes, but I doubt that we need bulldozers much; chain saws maybe.

Mr. LEONARD. Our contribution to those would be in the design and location. We would not let them construct a trail except on a location where we felt it could be handled without damage to soil and water and other facilities.

That is usually our investment—in the engineering aspects of the thing. The challenge of those vehicles is to get on terrain, of course, that has not been leveled with a bulldozer. It is very seldom that you have that. They like to demonstrate that they can go up the hill without a bulldozer.

Mr. OLIN. The rougher the better?

Mr. LEONARD. Yes.

Mr. OLIN. That is true.

I am aware that you are interested in running it properly. I just want to question that word had come down at one point that each

Digitized by Google

ranger, each district ranger was going to have to have a certain number of these trails in his ranger area, and they were going dutifully about planning where they would go.

We got the most awful reaction from the public that we have ever heard. They were up in arms with public meetings. The rangers spent so much time in these meetings that they did not have any time to spend on anything else.

It is not true, is it, that you are trying to force the creation of these trails in every particular area of the forest?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, sir.

Mr. OLIN. You will put them in where you can do it properly and where there is a demand and a responsible party using the trails so that you can maintain a reasonable amount of discipline?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. And I am not inclined to put any off-road vehicle trails anywhere unless there are some local clubs willing to pitch in and do the work to help manage and maintain them, because the Forest Service should not get caught up in the heavy financial burden over time trying to maintain these things.

Mr. OLIN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a part of our whole recreation strategy. I believe that the major contribution the Forest Service can make is to provide the land and the opportunities for outdoor recreation. If there is any organized group that wants to use this land that requires some investments, our first question is, what are you willing to do to help out.

As I say I think most of the work we are doing on off-road vehicle trails is with local clubs with them doing most of the work, and I think that is the way it ought to be. We do not have any quota or direction that I know of mandating that local rangers have to have a off-road vehicle trail. That would be inappropriate.

Mr. OLIN. I appreciate those remarks.

On that basis—certainly there is nothing wrong with experimenting with this for a while to see how this works out.

Thank you very much.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Dunlop, the Congress and the Forest Service have placed a great deal of emphasis on resource planning to recognize the decisions made now have some long-range implications for our national forests.

In addressing this budget, how does this budget compare to the combined totals of all of your forest land management plans needed in this budget.

Mr. DUNLOP. Yes, sir. I would have to give you my general recollection about this over a period of time over, maybe, the past 4 or 5 years.

We generally fund, or seek funding for about 75 percent of what the total potential would be if we were carrying out the forest management plans. In other words the optimum would be 100 percent. We cannot afford that, so it turns out that on the balance, on the average through all of the different accounts we fund these to about 75 percent of the optimum.

Is that correct, Chief?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. This budget would be somewhere around 75 percent of forest plans.

Digitized by Google

Mr. VOLKMER. Now when you fund it at 75 percent instead of 100 percent, do you take all categories within all the forest plans and cut them off evenly or are there certain things cut out, and certain things not cut back? If there are, I would like to know which areas basically get the short-fall?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, that will vary by individual line item. I have a sheet here that goes right down the list that would show percentagewise what this budget is of forest plans.

Mr. VOLKMER. Could we get a copy of that made?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. I would appreciate that. That would give me the areas where the cuts are made.

So when we look at it, now, what effect do those have on our forest plans as they are being developed? Are we going to have to make amendments to those forest plans?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think so. What you have is uneven implementation of those plans, and those plans are based on certain assumptions.

Now as we go 3 or 4 or 5 years here and there is a lack of investments in timber stand improvement, that affects what the allowable sale quantity is for timber. If we do not make the timber stand improvement investments then sometime down the line we are going to have to make adjustments in the allowable sale quantity.

There may be some other areas where that is true, but there are also a lot of investments that are not contingent or dependent upon their relationship to other programs.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well after reviewing it we may have some further discussion on that after I and the staff has a chance to review this.

Now, we also have our Resource Planning Act and our current projection program under that 5 years. As I understand it a division of the flat spending and then an increase, if I remember right?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir. There was the low bound and the high bound.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Where are we in this year's budget on that? Are we still low bound?

Mr. ROBERTSON. On the low bound?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes. In this year's budget?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have it high bound. I do not have it low bound.

Mr. LEONARD. We are in between the high bound and the low bound. Generally we are a little bit better than the low bound but below the high bound.

Mr. VOLKMER. All right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On high bound—research is 91 percent; State and private 52 percent; in the National Forest System around 73 to 74 percent.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think, gentlemen, I have reviewed the State and private forestry, and I see where the cuts came after reviewing the data that you have given me, and who made the cuts and stuff. To be honest with you I think it is just another area where this subcommittee, when we write our letter to the Budget Committee and to the Appropriations Committee, we will take the view just a little bit different than yours on those fundings.

Digitized by Google

The other thing that I would like to address a little bit more in detail because I am a little concerned about where we are as far as getting money—I know you are—for the fires coming up, yet, this year. How much money—and also I am concerned about reforestation? What do we have in that KV fund right now?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We ended the year with about $89 million. Yes, we ended fiscal year 1988 with $89 million.

Mr. VOLKMER. Now did you get any replenishment in that since October 1?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. As timber is harvested, receipts go into the KV fund.

In fact, to give you a summary we ended up the fiscal year with $89 million left in KV. We have a program plan for 1989 of about $213 million. So we have only about 50 percent of the money going into the fiscal year that it is going to take to get the reforestation and timber stand improvement work done.

So the other 50 percent is going to have to come from this year's collection from timber harvest.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well we are still talking about 1989 fiscal year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. So you are going to have to get that other 100 or so million. You say you need 200 and some to do it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. 213, and we had 89 of that going into the year.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right, so you have got to get the rest of the 124 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. And we believe we can do that. There is a little bit of a timing problem.

Mr. VOLKMER. But that is going to take care of the reforestation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. So what you are telling me is all that KV fund is going to be out of balance as far as firefighting is concerned?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. That well is dry. We cannot go back to that.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is gone. Then when I look at the budget that you have given us, and this is something I do not understand, and maybe you can help me here.

On the pages that you have submitted to us just today, and on the line where it says "Forest Fire Protection" I see "Fire Presuppression" in 1988 the final was $156,477,000, 1989 Appropriation $158,707,000; request to Department 181; request to OMB 164, only that is the wrong page.

Excuse me. I want to get back to another one. That is another one that the staff has given me.

Now I am back to where I want to be.

On line 88, I guess on the third page, is "Fighting Forest Fires."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Are you talking about the budget history of what we have requested?

Mr. VOLKMER. Right, the budget history.

Lines 99 on down we have "Fire Presuppression." We end up with request to Congress $164,204,000. We got that. We agree on that, right?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Then I get down to line 104 "Fighting Forest Fires." Now what is that for?

Digitized by Google

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the emergency fire fighting. That is money that we have that we only spend once we have a fire going.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right. But we get fires going all over the place?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. And presuppression is to what—put them out?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Presuppression is all of the work you do up to the point you have a fire going and you blow the whistle and somebody goes up and fights the fire.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So it is all of the prevention work that we do, the training of crews, the tools, the equipment, it pays for getting the airplanes under contract, and everything you have to do up to the point the fire crew goes out to fight the fire.

Mr. VOLKMER. Where is the money for actually going out and fighting the fires at?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the $85 million of emergency fire fighting forest fires.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right. What I do not understand is you made a request to the Department of only $1,059,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we were under the old system.

Mr. VOLKMER. What happened on that? That is what I do not understand. I want you to explain that one to me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We were not so optimistic that we were not going to have any forest fires.

Up until a couple of years ago, the way this item has been funded, we never knew how much money we were going to need because it ranged all the way from $30 to $40 million to over $400 million last year. We just put a nominal amount of money in that: $1 million.

Well, we borrow money from KV and Congress would come along, based on our request and issue a supplemental to repay the KV fund.

A couple of years ago it was thought that the Congress wanted to put the money up front so, as you can see, the previous year in 1989 you boosted our request from about $1 million to $125 million.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right. I remember that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So, we just went back with the old approach of putting in a small amount.

Mr. VOLKMER. So you do the same approach and let the Congress give you the money? In other words, when you really get down to it even $85 million is not enough if we have half the forest fires that we had last year?

Mr. LEONARD. No. As a matter of fact we have spent over $30 million this current fiscal year already.

Mr. VOLKMER. Fighting fires?

Mr. LEONARD. Fighting fires, yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. And we are not even into the real season?

Mr. LEONARD. And we are not even through the winter, yet.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is the reason you have also requested a supplemental?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right. This budget has a request for $250 million supplemental to repay the KV fund.

Digitized by Google

Mr. VOLKMER. My problem is, and I think that your problem is going to be that if that supplemental does not get there until September which could be the problem.

All right. The last thing I would like to talk to you about is something that is pretty close to my heart. I do not have to worry too much about the counties in my district getting reimbursements to replace their tax.

As you know I have been concerned about the research construction funds, and I notice that when you made your submission that it appears that the submission to the Department would have been quite adequate, and the request by the Department to OMB may not have been adequate for the things that you ought to have contemplated doing, the needs as you see them. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. We requested $11.6 million——

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And we ended up with 2.6.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that was two key areas. We had included money for our share of the construction of the new lab at the University of Missouri——

Mr. VOLKMER. Right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And then the problem we have with research out in Tempe, Arizona, is where the Barry Goldwater Engineering Center is being built over our lab; so, we have got to do something there.

Mr. VOLKMER. Right. I understand that.

And what concerns me about this last figure is the fact that we have already had private funds contributed for this cooperative research for a forestry research lab out there. I just talked to one of my State senators who is chairman of the corporation committee out there, and I think they are gearing up to put some money in from the State to start it, and it looks like we are going to be the only ones sitting out here holding it up, and that concerns me a little bit about that.

Then the other thing is as long as we are on that I have the notice in here that the next line item "Construction for Forest Administration and Operation." And as you know we have had a problem in the past of proposals to trade forestry assets for administrative buildings—you know where we are there. I was happy to see that you have requested these additional monies, but you did not end up with getting very much for those administrative buildings.

What type of backlog do we actually have in both research and in forest administration buildings that are needed out in these national forests? Can we have some kind of a list on that? Not necessarily where they are, but give us the amounts that we really need to bring us up to date of what is really needed out there?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. We can provide that list.

[The material follows:]

Digitized by Google

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FIRE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER

SITUATION

Reduced funding levels have seriously reduced our ability to provide and manage support facilities for Forest Service operations in a cost-effective, safe and efficient manner.

FA&O FUNDING CONTINUES TO DECLINE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

FISCAL YEAR	AGENCY REQUEST	DEPARTMENT ALLOWANCE	PRESIDENT'S BUDGET	APPROPRIATION
1990	16,575	16,575	6,500	N/A
1989	14,550	14,550	6,523	8,321
1988	26,498	10,131	7,506	6,745
1987	28,081	12,012	6,492	8,646
1986	25,565	16,779	13,190	15,316
1985	18,734	13,167	13,149	12,886

FUNDING NEEDS

There exists a backlog of identified construction and reconstruction work needed valued at $273 million. Approximately $98 million of this amount falls in the category of Health and Safety.

We estimate an annual funding of $32,000,000 is needed to provide safe, effective, and efficient support facilities. This would provide for normal annual replacement and rehabilitation cost and eliminate the backlog in approximately 10 years. This would be considered a maximum level program.

It will take approximately $15,000,000 annually to provide a normal replacement and rehabilitation program as well as all health and safety related construction and reconstruction and priority replacement of high cost lease facilities over the next 10 years. This would be considered an acceptable minimum program; however it would not eliminate any other types of backlog work.

IMPACTS OF CONTINUED LOW FUNDING.

We are unable to continue to provide for the health and safety of employees and publics that use our facilities.

We are unable to meet legal requirements, such as providing adequate fire and handicap access.

We lose the opportunity to cooperate with other agencies on cost effective co-location.

We lose the opportunity to move out of high-cost leases by replacing these with owned offices.

Our effort in facilities master planning has identified needed building replacement and support facilities. Planning quality remains high but, without effective execution of planning efforts, this will diminish.

We are in danger of losing the facilities engineering and design staffs required to plan, develop and manage our support facilities.

Digitized by Google

MAINTENANCE PROGRAM
FIRE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER

SITUATION

Reduced funding levels have seriously reduced our ability to provide and manage support facilities for Forest Service operations in a cost-effective, safe and efficient manner.

FA&O FUNDING CONTINUES TO DECLINE.
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

FISCAL YEAR	AGENCY REQUEST	DEPARTMENT ALLOWANCE	PRESIDENT'S BUDGET	APPROPRIATION
1990	23,529	17,902	16,953	N/A
1989	22,870	22,870	16,953	17,553
1988	20,670	20,670	16,005	16,533
1987	17,812	15,042	14,735	15,055
1986	15,325	16,495	14,857	14,124
1985	20,231	16,114	16,091	14,754

FUNDING NEEDS

We have a backlog of identified maintenance work valued at approximately $90,000,000.

We estimate $28,000,000 is needed to maintain safe, effective, and efficient support facilities. This would provide for recurring maintenance and critical needs and eliminate the backlog of work over the next 10 years.

Approximately $21,000,000 will enable us to take care of recurring maintenance and critical needs, including the backlog of health and safety related maintenance work. This would be considered a minimum program and will not decrease the remaining backlog.

IMPACTS OF CONTINUED LOW FUNDING

We are not able to do the work identified each year. This has created the backlog of identified maintenance work valued at $90,000,000 which will continue to grow.

A continuing deterioration of the Forest Service facilities will inevitably jeopardize the productivity of employees and the quality of life.

Digitized by Google

Mr. VOLKMER. We will see if it can be of any help in getting some of that—I do not know how much we can get, but getting some of that done.

I know surely from what I have heard from what some of the proposals have been some of our buildings in these national forests probably are getting pretty antiquated, and we need to improve it and get some modernized operations.

Mr. LEONARD. A large share of our structures out there are what were built during the 3 C's days in the Depression, and they are well over 50 years old. There is a need to do some reconstruction.

Mr. VOLKMER. Does the gentleman from Alabama have any additional questions?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

One other thing I wanted to mention is that in our State for the last few years we have had a program called the treasured forest. I am not sure you are familiar with it or not. It brings together all the different agencies and coordinates efforts.

As you know you have the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife, and different ones—the Soil Conservation Service—it brings it all together and deals strictly with private plans, and it is going to be an initiative at the national level to try to expand the concept. You would have coordination of different activities of things available from the different agencies we have mentioned. With a piece of legislation that would be forthcoming would be introduced by members of the Forestry 2000 to try to bring that about. I hope that it would be an attempt to bring a lot of things together. It is not very cost effective at this time when we have several different agencies involved, and there is no coordination of the scarce dollars coming out of those agencies.

But they could also be subjected to bring the multiuse idea into the State and private forestry area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VOLKMER. Thank you.

That will conclude our hearing. We may have some additional questions to submit to you in writing. We would appreciate you getting those back to us within the near future, and we will hold the record open for about 10 days or 2 weeks until we get those answers back.

With that, thank you very much. I appreciate your testimony. You have been very helpful. We will be glad to work with you on the future of our national forests.

[Whereupon, at 12:18 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

Digitized by Google

STATEMENT OF
GEORGE S. DUNLOP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the
Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms and Energy
Committee on Agriculture
United States House of Representatives

Concerning H.R. 829, a bill "To make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Supression Act."

March 1, 1989

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

Thank you for this opportunity to present the Department of Agriculture's views on H.R. 829, a bill "To make permanent the authority provided under the Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act." With me today is Dale Robertson, Chief of the Forest Service.

The Administration strongly supports the enactment of H.R. 829.

The Temporary Emergency Wildfire Suppression Act was enacted during the 100th Congress in response to the extreme wildfire situation in the Greater Yellowstone Area and other parts of the West in 1988. The act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into reciprocal agreements with any foreign fire organization for mutual aid in wildfire protection. This authority expired on December 31.

Digitized by Google

The need for foreign firefighting resources is a recurring one whenever catastrophic wildfires have all available Federal and State firefighting resources committed. This legislation would allow other nations to utilize American wildfire protection resources when they have similar needs.

H.R. 829 would simply remove the December 31, 1988, termination date so as to make the authority permanent. No other changes would be made.

We strongly urge that H.R. 829 be enacted soon so that this authority will be restored before the 1989 summer fire season.

We wish to sincerely thank you, Mr. Chairman and the Subcommittee for your assistance on this issue in both this Congress and the 100th Congress. The ability to utilize highly trained personnel and specialized equipment from Canada was very helpful during the 1988 fire season.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared testimony. Chief Robertson and I will be pleased to respond to your questions and to provide additional information at your request.

Digitized by Google

STATEMENT OF
GEORGE S. DUNLOP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the House Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms, and Energy

March 1, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to highlight the fiscal year 1990 budget for the Forest Service. I am accompanied by F. Dale Robertson, Chief, Forest Service and George M. Leonard, Associate Chief.

Before Chief Robertson discusses the proposed Forest Service budget, I would like to explain briefly some of the policy issues addressed in the Administration's initial budget and the revisions which affect the Forest Service.

The Budget Revision

President Bush submitted his budget revisions to the Congress on February 9. These revisions included 2 proposals which could have significant effects on the Forest Service program for FY 1990:

- The President proposed to increase the planned acquisition of recreation lands to $206 million in total for the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior. This matches the total appropriated for lands acquisition in FY 1989. The Forest Service share of the 1989 appropriation was $64 million. The allocation among the land management organizations for FY 1990 will be developed based on overall priorities among potential acquisitions.

- The remainder of the Forest Service budget is subject to the "flexible freeze" proposal. This proposal is intended to hold FY 1990 outlays for a number of discretionary programs to the FY 1989 outlay level of $136 billion. The distribution of the appropriation among the various programs and agencies is subject to negotiation with Congress. I cannot tell you what this means for the Forest Service because it is completely open to negotiation.

Digitized by Google

The Initial Budget Proposal

As I know you are only too painfully aware, the overall fiscal situation has compelled an initial budget proposal which is below the amounts appropriated for FY 1989 While the revised proposal permits some flexibility, there is still a need for restraint. Until such time as negotiations are completed the initial budget proposal is controlling.

The Administration sees a continuing need for deliberate reductions in government spending through better identification of priorities Indeed, it is required if the deficit ceiling mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act is to be met. The initial FY 1990 budget authority for the Forest Service accomplishes this objective through a slight decrease in overall funding. Efforts have been made to address the wide array of program needs on National Forests, carry out priority research, and provide coordination with States.

Although the initial budget proposal for the National Forest System is less than the Agency s current program level the budget continues a vigorous National Recreation Strategy which we began last fiscal year and requests $ .5 million for challenge cost share projects in wildlife fisheries and recreation The timber sale offer level in the budget request is slightly less than the Forest Service is offering this year. The Agency's construction program will be slightly smaller with road construction and reconstruction emphasizing access for timber sales Funding includes $1 5 million for challenge cost share expanding this successful concept to road construction by entering into partnerships with public and private entities.

The initial budget proposes a major improvement in funding forest fire protection. A permanent indefinite appropriation would be established for fire protection, emergency suppression, and emergency rehabilitation of burned over lands. It would be financed from the general fund and offset by deposits of timber and on-shore mineral receipts to the general fund. The amount of the deposit would be deducted from total receipts prior to calculating the payments to be made to the States. This would provide an automatic, dependable appropriation for meeting our fundamental responsibilities for protecting public safety and valuable natural resources.

In connection with the fire protection funding proposal, there is an additional matter relating to our activities in wilderness that I would like to raise.

One of the lessons we have been forcefully reminded of through the fires this past summer in the Yellowstone area is that the potential force of fire is awesome It can lead to great costs in terms of resources destroyed investments lost, longer term economic effects and involve substantial direct costs of suppression This suggests that we do need to pay careful attention to presuppression activities including vegetative management in all areas. This applies to wilderness as well as areas managed for other uses Designation of wilderness does not mean that we can ignore fire. This raises the question of the appropriateness of activities undertaken in wilderness to adequately manage wild fires. In many cases, a program of prescribed burning and presuppression may be needed to mitigate the wildfire threat to the

Digitized by Google

wilderness areas, to adjacent forest lands, nearby developments, and other ownerships. In other cases, it may be desirable to interrupt large contiguous areas of heavy fuel types to reduce the risk of uncontrollable large fires. In short, we all ought to consider whether the degree that we impose restrictions in wilderness is appropriate or whether more latitude in our practices would permit better protection of these extremely valuable resources.

The initial 1990 program level for Forest Service research is also slightly smaller than this year's, but the program will be more tightly focused. The budget will continue the new research challenge cost-share program, and add emphasis to six priority research programs. In response to the urgent need to slow the rate of deforestation in the tropics and to increase benefits to the United States from foreign technology, the Forest Service will improve its international forestry program in FY 1990. Additional activities are planned in technical assistance to tropical countries, training, research, and scientific exchange. It is gratifying to see over 80 years of Forest Service expertise in land management research and application directed to forestry concerns on a more global scale.

Although the requested program level for the Forest Service's State and Private Forestry programs is significantly less than the 1989 program, the budget will boost the emphasis on forest pest management on Federal lands. The proposed increase in forest pest management will help implement the Agency's strategic plan for forest health, including special projects to improve pest management technology.

Increased Public Service

I would like to take a moment to commend the Congress for actions that will permit the Forest Service to improve efficiency and service to the public. First, the 1989 appropriation change from 1-year to 2-year fund availability is extremely important. This will allow better project planning and implementation and flexibility to deal with the natural vagaries of fire and weather.

Second, the congressional support for the pilot project to simplify budget structure and to test reliance on output targets rather than detailed budget line items is viewed as very promising by the Forest Service. It has already provided the means to stretch limited Federal dollars and expand opportunities for increased public use and enjoyment of the lands managed by the Forest Service. The project can also simplify accounting and reduce the need to come back to the Congress for numerous minor adjustments among line items. The "charge-as-worked" initiative and detailed timber sale cost accounting system will give the Congress and the Executive Branch a better basis for making funding decisions.

I believe it is important that the record show that the Forest Service has, over the past decade of budget restraint, achieved a record of significantly expanded public service. This has been done with employment 28 percent lower in FY 1988 than in FY 1979, and with funding 13 percent lower in real terms than in FY 1979. Actions taken to bring about this dramatic increase in

Digitized by Google

efficiency include undertaking a number of special productivity studies, installing a modern computer system throughout the Forest Service, and sharing administrative services among various organizations.

Closing

Before I turn this over to Chief Robertson, I would like to say that my years working with the Forest Service have been a pleasure. You and the Forest Service are engaged in important undertakings and purposes, and I trust that with your help, the Forest Service will continue to provide outstanding service to the Nation in the years ahead.

Thank you.

Digitized by Google

Draft

2/16/89 - 1:45 PM (HISTSUMM\FY1989\89SUMM)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
HISTORICAL SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 1989 - DESCRIPTION -- EXPANDED VERSION	1988 Final Appn.	1989 Agency Request	1989 Department Allowance	1989 President's Budget	1989 House Action	1989 Senate Action	1989 Appropriation Act
FOREST RESEARCH:							
Forest Protection Research	31,498	38,641	35,939	33,260	33,181	32,981	33,181
Resource Analysis Research	25,353	26,885	24,733	23,470	25,747	24,178	25,617
Timber Management Research	26,548	29,881	25,772	24,721	26,611	25,389	26,972
Forest Environment Research	29,259	33,356	30,152	29,080	30,448	30,056	31,100
Forest Products and Harvesting Research	19,860	22,057	19,653	18,748	20,378	19,995	20,497
Special Projects, Competitive Grants	3,800	0	4,800	0	3,800	0	0
Research challenge cost-share program	0	0	0	0	500	0	500
TOTAL, FOREST RESEARCH	135,510	150,660	140,249	129,279	139,865	132,599	137,867
STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY:							
Forest Pest Management							
Federal Lands:							
Surveys and Technical Assistance	13,689	14,727	14,727	14,255	14,135	14,135	14,135
Insect and Disease Suppression	16,959	13,192	13,192	10,560	15,854	15,854	15,854
Special Projects	1,216	1,745	1,345	1,219	1,211	1,211	1,211
Cooperative Lands:							
Surveys and Technical Assistance	2,077	3,480	2,280	2,077	2,077	2,077	2,077
Insect and Disease Suppression	10,500	5,800	4,800	0	10,800	10,800	10,800
Appalachian IPM	0	0	0	0	0	7,500	5,600
Subtotal, Forest Pest Management	44,441	38,864	35,464	28,111	44,077	51,077	49,677
Fire Protection	13,770	13,166	6,166	3,870	13,851	13,851	13,851
Forest Management and Utilization:							
Forest Resource Management	4,993	5,736	4,070	0	4,983	4,983	4,983
Wood Utilization	1,994	1,037	1,037	0	991	991	991
Seedlings, Nursery, and Tree Improvement	1,798	2,324	2,324	0	1,795	1,795	1,795
Urban Forestry	1,998	1,316	914	0	2,496	1,996	2,496
Subtotal, Forest Management and Utilization	10,783	10,413	8,345	0	10,265	9,765	10,265
Special Projects:							
Boundary Waters Canoe Area	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies	200	0	0	0	200	0	200
Lake Tahoe (PL 96-586)	1,400	0	0	0	1,400	1,400	1,400
Cache La Poudre River Corridor	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kellog, ID Gondola	6,400	0	0	0	0	0	0
Centennial Trail Washington	0	3,587	0	0	3,600	0	3,600
Centennial Trail Idaho	0	0	0	0	1,350	0	1,350
Old Columbia Hwy in Oregon	0	0	0	0	600	0	0
Two Forks Resource Analysis - Colorado	0	0	0	0	0	75	75
Timber Bridge Initiative	0	0	0	0	0	2,700	2,700
Economic Diversification Studies	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	500
New England Timber Resource Analysis	0	0	0	0	0	250	250
Subtotal, Special Projects	10,075	6,387	2,000	2,000	9,950	8,225	12,075
TOTAL, STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY	79,869	67,930	52,775	34,781	78,143	82,918	86,668

Digitized by Google

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
HISTORICAL SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 1989 - DESCRIPTION -- EXPANDED VERSION	1988 Final Appn.	1989 Agency Request	1989 Department Allowance	1989 President's Budget	1989 House Action	1989 Senate Action	1989 Appropriation Act
NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM:							
Land and Resource Protection:							
Minerals Area Management	26,683	30,890	30,890	29,611	29,396	27,651	28,439
Real Estate Management:							
Land Exchange & Adjustment	5,265	7,046	7,046	5,746	6,951	5,685	6,445
Land Classification, Status & Planning	2,415	3,339	3,339	2,723	3,383	2,783	3,063
Special Uses	8,986	11,205	11,205	9,128	11,061	9,050	10,256
Geometronics	5,168	6,241	6,241	5,097	6,188	5,065	5,739
Subtotal, Real Estate Management	21,834	27,831	27,831	22,694	27,583	22,583	25,503
Land Line Location	26,651	32,489	32,489	29,678	27,153	29,860	28,678
Maintenance of Facilities	16,533	22,870	22,870	16,983	17,553	17,553	17,553
Forest Fire Protection	165,029	186,783	175,836	154,992	167,779	153,873	166,616
Fighting Forest Fires	125,000	1,066	1,066	35,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Cooperative Law Enforcement	9,669	11,245	11,245	11,245	10,015	11,215	10,615
Forest Road Maintenance	83,748	72,698	72,698	68,133	72,396	81,229	80,729
Forest Trai Maintenance	20,826	22,776	15,636	15,636	20,656	20,797	20,797
Total, Land Resource Protection	495,165	408,568	389,761	383,934	497,653	489,681	503,930
Renewable Resource Management & Utilization:							
Sales Administration and Management:							
Timber Resource Inventory Planning	16,177	16,945	16,945	16,987	16,486	17,778	17,278
Silvicultural Examination	26,619	28,161	28,161	27,090	27,615	27,600	27,600
Sales Preparat	98,432	186,783	186,783	186,076	186,197	188,396	185,896
Harvest Administration	44,333	63,544	63,544	63,099	52,556	62,556	57,556
Subtotal, Sales Admin. & Mgmt.	185,561	215,433	215,433	213,972	202,854	216,330	207,530
Reforestation & Stand Improvement:							
Reforestation --1/	47,021	48,447	48,447	48,290	47,527	47,527	47,527
Timber Stand Improvement (TSI) --1/	23,235	36,973	36,973	30,350	31,899	31,899	31,899
Nursery and Tree Improvement Operations	14,667	19,427	19,427	17,592	15,859	15,859	15,859
Subtotal, Reforestation & TSI --1/	84,923	96,847	96,847	88,232	95,285	95,285	95,285
Recreation Use:							
Recreation Management	96,945	141,671	113,818	96,689	111,585	112,437	111,583
Wilderness Management	12,581	14,918	12,634	12,664	14,692	14,692	14,692
Cultural Resource Management	14,216	12,592	17,941	12,809	15,746	15,746	15,979
Subtotal, Recreation Use	123,742	169,373	144,385	122,162	141,943	142,875	142,254
Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management:							
Wildlife Fisheries Admin. & Resource Coord.	29,352	38,153	37,839	32,288	32,222	36,288	34,792
Wildlife Habitat Improvement	5,634	12,487	7,758	5,356	6,576	7,454	6,951
Fish Habitat Improvement	3,846	5,118	4,823	2,724	4,782	7,680	6,282
Endang., Threat. & Sensitive Species Hab. Imp.	4,489	3,611	3,220	2,179	7,150	7,150	7,150
Anadromous Fish	4,123	9,431	7,126	2,858	7,074	10,484	9,899
Subtotal, Wildlife & Fish Habitat Management	47,444	68,800	59,966	45,397	57,724	68,984	64,994

--1/ Includes $30 million from Ref. Trust Fund, of which $25 million is for ref. and $5 million is for timber stand improvement.

Digitized by Google

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
HISTORICAL SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 1989 - DESCRIPTION -- EXPANDED VERSION	1988 Final Appn.	1989 Agency Request	1989 Department Allowance	1989 President's Budget	1989 House Action	1989 Senate Action	1989 Appropriation Act	
Range Management:								
Range Vegetation Management	25,670	31,195	27,838	24,155	26,857	26,762	26,966	
Range Forage Improvement	274	1,187	383	382	1,186	1,186	756	
Range Structural Improvement	1,442	1,118	557	538	724	755	1,105	
Wild Horses Burro Management	286	241	200	181	301	181	181	
Noxious Weed Control	1,553	1,614	1,241	1,069	1,557	1,559	1,559	
Subtotal, Range Management	29,225	35,347	30,227	26,325	30,545	30,363	30,567	
Soil, Water and Air Management:								
Soil, Water, Air Operations	25,677	36,943	36,943	27,393	28,847	31,082	29,922	
Soil Water Resource Improvement	3,291	3,276	3,276	2,235	7,705	4,198	6,248	
Soi Water Inventories	6,303	4,667	4,667	4,669	6,134	6,634	6,634	
Subtotal, Soil Water Air Management	35,271	44,886	44,886	34,297	41,886	41,986	42,804	
Total, Renewable Resource Mgmt. & Util.	586,166	630,686	591,744	530,385	570,237	595,751	583,442	
General Administration	266,860	285,871	285,871	275,336	271,354	273,586	272,116	
Restoration trust fund transfer	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	
Excess Timber Receipts (est)	0	0	0	0	0	103,000	103,000	
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM	1,239,991	1,295,125	1,237,376	1,159,655	1,309,244	1,432,018	1,432,488	
CONSTRUCTION:								
Research Construction	2,988	4,010	4,010	682	1,550	1,550	1,550	
Construction for FA&O	6,745	14,550	14,550	6,523	9,445	8,321	8,321	
Recreation Use Areas Construction	17,998	20,876	20,876	19,157	24,043	20,022	24,043	
Subtotal, Construction of Facilities	27,643	39,436	39,436	26,282	35,038	29,893	33,914	
Forest Road Construction	171,764	213,398	213,398	196,849	165,557	188,157	175,657	
Forest Trai Construction	14,671	13,777	13,777	12,643	15,947	15,947	15,947	
Forest Roads Purchaser Construction	(103,781)	(125,367)	(125,367)	(125,367)	(64,000)	(188,367)	(128,778)	
Less Rec Trail Const. to OHWF	0	0	0	(31,000)	0	0	0	
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	214,078	266,611	266,611	203,974	216,542	225,997	225,518	
HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION: MOUNT ST. HELENS --1/	0	0	0	0	(5,333)	(5,333)	(5,333)	
LAND ACQUISITION (L&WCF)								
Acquisition Management	4,181	4,379	4,379	3,900	3,900	3,000	4,000	
Land Purchases	44,895	0	0	0	38,345	53,834	59,605	
Subtotal, Land Acquisition	49,076	4,379	4,379	3,900	42,245	57,734	64,205	
ACQ. OF LANDS FOR NF SPECIAL ACTS	966	1,018	1,018	966	966	966	966	
ACQ. OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES	385	335	335	335	335	335	335	
APPROPRIATED MISC. TRUST FUNDS	3	96	96	90	30	90	90	
RANGE BETTERMENT FUND	3,605	3,875	3,875	3,875	3,875	3,875	3,946	
OPERATION MAINT. OF RECREATION FACILITIES	0	0	0	31,000	0	0	0	
YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS	(1,000)	0	0	0	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	
TONGASS TIMBER SUPPLY FUND	(50,003)	40,699	40,699	40,699	25,264	40,699	35,999	
TOTAL, APPROPRIATED FUNDS	1,723,483	1,830,748	1,747,413	1,609,354	1,816,509	1,977,231	1,988,082	15,425

--1/ To be financed by the State of Washington's share of Federal Highway Funds

Digitized by Google

2/16/89 - 1:45 PM (HISTSUMM\FY1989\89SUMM)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOREST SERVICE
HISTORICAL SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989
(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 1989 - DESCRIPTION -- EXPANDED VERSION	1988 Final Appn.	1989 Agency Request	1989 Department Allowance	1989 President's Budget	1989 House Action	1989 Senate Action	1989 Appropriation Act	
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, WORKING FUNDS								
Expenses, Brush Disposal	50,607	59,792	59,792	54,600	54,600	54,600	54,600	
Licensee Programs: Woodsey/Smokey	106	109	109	109	109	109	109	
Restoration of Forest Lands Improvements	00	107	107	107	107	107	107	
Timber Purch, Roads Constructed by FS --1/	21,037	9,037	9,037	9,037	9,037	9,037	9,037	
Timber Salvage Sales	66,174	21,000	21,000	27,000	37,561	47,561	47,561	
Tongass Timber Supply Fund	50,003	(40,699)	(40,699)	(40,699)	(25,264)	(40,699)	(35,999)	
Operation and Maintenance of Quarters	5,610	5,069	5,069	5,069	5,069	5,069	5,069	
Subtotal, Permanent Apprns,Working Funds	201,617	97,602	97,602	97,602	108,163	118,163	118,163	
Payment to States Gross	300,761	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	
Proposed Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Payment to States - Net	300,761	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	306,433	49,521
TOTAL, PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS	502,378	404,035	404,035	404,035	414,596	424,596	424,596	49,521
COOPERATIVE WORK, FOREST SERVICE (Trust Fund)								
CWFS-KV	238,002	204,145	204,145	204,145	204,145	204,145	204,145	
CWFS-Other	58,332	63,603	63,603	63,603	63,603	63,603	63,603	
TOTAL, COOPERTIVE WORK, FOREST SERVICE	296,334	267,748	267,748	267,748	267,748	267,748	267,748	
REFORESTATION TRUST FUND	30,907	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	
TOTAL, REGULAR FOREST SERVICE	2,553,102	2,532,531	2,449,196	2,311,137	2,528,853	2,699,575	2,710,426	34,096
TRANSFER FUNDS								
Rural Community Fire Protection (FmHa)	3,091	N/A	N/A	3,091	N/A	N/A	3,091	
Watershed Flood Prevention (SCS)	3,061	N/A	N/A	3,198	N/A	N/A	3,198	
Watershed Planning (SCS)	241	N/A	N/A	228	N/A	N/A	228	
Resource Conservation Development (SCS)	771	N/A	N/A	718	N/A	N/A	718	
River Basin I.A. (SCS)	852	N/A	N/A	852	N/A	N/A	852	
Pesticide Assessment (SEA)	369	N/A	N/A	369	N/A	N/A	369	
Oregon California Grant Lands, BLM-USDI	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Federal Highway Trust (FHA)-DOT	28,219	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	
Forestry Incentives Program (ASCS)	0	0	0	1,245	0	0	1,245	
Agricultural Conservation Program	0	0	0	1,769	0	0	1,769	
Job Corps (DOL)	58,141	N/A	N/A	57,244	N/A	N/A	57,244	
Senior Community Service Employment Program	22,000	N/A	N/A	22,245	N/A	N/A	22,245	
TOTAL, TRANSFERS TO FOREST SERVICE	(119,545)	0	0	(90,959)	0	0	(90,959)	
GRAND TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE	2,553,102	2,532,531	2,449,196	2,311,137	2,528,853	2,699,575	2,710,426	

--1/ Does not reflect rescission of unobligated balance of $30 million since the rescission did not impact the program.

Digitized by Google

STATEMENT OF
F. DALE ROBERTSON, CHIEF
FOREST SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the House Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Forests, Family Farms, and Energy

March 1, 1989

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to discuss our 1990 budget with you.

FY 1990 Budget

The 1990 initial budget request for the Forest Service is $2.5 billion compared with $2.7 billion appropriated in 1989.

As described by Assistant Secretary Dunlop, President Bush has proposed freezing aggregate spending on a number of domestic programs at their 1989 levels. The intent of the proposal is that the Administration and Congress reach agreement on the total. This could result in more or less for the Forest Service, depending on how the total is distributed.

Additionally, President Bush has proposed to fund land acquisition, financed by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, at the 1989 enacted level of $206 million for the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. The Forest Service share is subject to ongoing negotiations within the Administration concerning the priority of Forest Service acquisitions versus Department of the Interior acquisitions.

Since the final budget request is subject to negotiation, my testimony will focus on the initial proposal. At this funding level, we will continue to do high-priority research, protect Federal lands from fire and pests, and provide a balanced resource management program on the National Forests and Grasslands. Receipts from lands managed by the Forest Service are estimated at $1.7 billion, compared with $1.6 billion anticipated for 1989.

Forest Research

The initial budget request for Forest Research is $133.8 million, compared with $137.9 million appropriated in 1989. About 30 percent of the research budget is devoted to six priority areas: global climate change; catastrophic forest fires; water quality--cumulative effects from forests and rangelands; expanding economic opportunities through new wood products; southern forest productivity; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species. We will continue the challenge cost-share program, started by Congress in the 1989 appropriation. We include $500,000 within the regular Forest Research line items, rather than including this program as a separate budget line item.

Digitized by Google

State and Private Forestry

The initial budget request is $48.6 million, compared with $86.7 million appropriated in 1989. The primary emphasis will be on forest pest management on Federal lands; we propose $37.6 million, a $6.4 million increase over 1989. The budget will help implement the Forest Service's strategic plan for forest health, including special projects to improve pest management technology. The Forest Service is assuming responsibility for eradication of all isolated gypsy moth infestations on or adjacent to Federal lands and for eradication of isolated infestations exceeding 640 acres on any private lands.

Except for the cooperative pest surveys and funding to Minnesota for intensive management associated with the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, financial assistance to States would be discontinued. Also, the forest management and utilization program, including urban forestry, would be terminated.

National Forest System

Funding of $1.3 billion is proposed, about $100 million less than appropriated in 1989, including $282 million for fire protection and suppression. The budget contains an important proposal, described in the Federal Wildland Firefighting section of my testimony to change the way that fire protection is funded. This proposal will eliminate the uncertainty of whether the trust fund account will be reimbursed for funds transferred for firefighting. To that end, I am happy to note that the budget does include a proposed supplemental of $250 million to partially reimburse the trust fund.

An additional $9.0 million derived from expanded recreation user charges will be available for recreation management activities.

We plan to offer 11.351 billion board feet of timber, compared to 11.505 billion board feet planned for 1989. Of the 11.351 billion board feet planned, 11.029 billion board feet is sustainable into the future. We expect a harvest level of 12.2 billion board feet in fiscal year 1990, the same as anticipated in fiscal year 1989.

Construction

Funding of $221.0 million is proposed for construction, compared to $225.5 million appropriated in 1989. The road construction and reconstruction program will emphasize access for timber sales. Included in the proposal is $1.5 million for challenge cost share road projects. Trail construction is about $2.1 million higher than the FY 1989 program.

The initial budget includes $17.0 million for facility construction, compared to $33 9 million appropriated in 1989. In addition to the $7.9 million for recreation construction, $7.5 million is proposed from Operation and Maintenance of Recreation Facilities for recreation rehabilitation or reconstruction, and is based on new legislation to expand user fees, soon to be submitted to Congress.

Digitized by Google

Federal Wildland Firefighting

Proposed legislation in FY 1990 will establish a permanent indefinite appropriation, financed from the general fund and offset by deposits of timber and onshore mineral receipts to the general fund, for fire protection and suppression activities. This will permit essential fire protection activities to be paid for without using funds provided for other purposes. Timber and mineral receipts, equal to estimated fire costs, would be deducted from total receipts prior to calculating State shares. In FY 1990, we estimate that timber and mineral receipt sharing payments will be reduced by about 18.4 percent.

Protection will continue to be set at a level consistent with other budget priorities each year. In 1990 we propose $173.1 million for fire protection. Emergency firefighting will continue to be whatever is required, but will be financed from the general fund of the Treasury, instead of transfers from accounts established for other purposes.

Challenge Cost-Share

We have had tremendous success with our challenge cost-share program, and are expanding it in our 1990 budget, from $6.5 million in 1989 to $13.5 million in 1990. In Forest Research we propose $500 thousand, the same as appropriated in 1989. We are increasing the program for recreation and wildlife. In recreation and trails we propose $5.5 million, compared to $3.0 million in 1989. In wildlife, we propose $6.0 million, compared to $3.0 million in 1989. We are expanding the concept to include road construction in 1990, at a level of $1.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I will be happy to answer any questions the Committee might have.

Digitized by Google

FY 1990 Fire Program Funding Proposal
(Dollars in Thousands)

Fire Program Costs

USDA.....	281,992
DOI.....	166,500
Total.....	448,492

Distribution of Reduction in Receipt Sharing Bases

	Receipts	Percent of Total	Deduction from Receipt Sharing Base	
DOI Timber Receipts	149,800	6.1%	27,579	
DOI Mineral Receipts	890,231	36.5%	163,898	
USDA Timber Receipts	1,316,000	54.0%	242,286	: 257,015
USDA Minerals Receipts	80,000	3.3%	14,729	:
Total	2,436,031	100.0%	448,492	

Calculation of FS Receipt Sharing Payments

	Current Legislation	Proposed Legislation
Receipts Subject to Sharing	1,457,600	1,457,600
Less Fire Funding Offset	-0-	-257,015
Total	1,457,600	1,200,585
Receipt Sharing Percentage	X 25%	X 25%
Receipt Sharing Payments	364,400	300,146

The 1990 proposal would result in a reduction in FS receipt sharing payments of $64.3 million. It should be noted that only FS timber and minerals receipts subject to receipt sharing are reduced before calculating the payments. Other FS receipts continue to be shared according to existing law.

Digitized by Google

01/24/89 - 9:30 AM (90ITEMS)
(FY1990/PRESBUD/90ITEMS)
Numbers enclosed in () are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM 8 -- BUDGET REQUEST H'STORY TABLE

FY 1990 - DESCRIPTION - EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS	
FOREST RESEARCH:						
Fire and Atmospheric Sciences Research	8,945	9,142	11,126	9,914	9,785	OLD LINE ITEMS
Forest Insect and Disease Research	22,545	24,039	26,534	24,623	22,419	
Forest Inventory and Analysis	17,664	17,412	18,962	18,628	17,773	
Renewable Resources Economics Research	4,977	5,297	5,772	5,272	4,783	
Timber Management Research	26,548	26,972	33,272	28,511	26,454	
Watershed Management & Rehabilitation Research	16,692	17,985	19,705	18,129	17,100	
Wildlife, Range, and Fish Habitat Research	12,567	13,115	15,806	13,583	12,616	
Forest Recreation Research	2,712	2,988	3,127	3,018	2,998	
Forest Products and Harvesting Research	19,860	20,497	23,466	20,830	19,871	
Special Projects, Competitive Grants	3,000	0	0	0	0	
Research challenge cost share program	0	500	0	0	0	
TOTAL, FOREST RESEARCH	135,510	137,867	157,770	142,500	133,799	
FOREST RESEARCH:						
Forest Protection Research	31,498	33,181	37,660	34,537	32,804	NEW LINE ITEMS
Resource Analysis Research	25,353	25,617	27,861	26,910	25,984	
Timber Management Research	26,548	26,972	33,272	28,511	26,454	
Forest Environment Research	29,259	31,100	35,511	31,712	29,716	
Forest Products and Harvesting Research	19,860	20,497	23,466	20,830	19,871	
Special Projects, Competitive Grants	3,000	0	0	0	0	
Research challenge cost share program 1/	0	500	0	0	0	
TOTAL, FOREST RESEARCH	135,510	137,867	157,770	142,500	133,799	

1/ INCLUDED IN OTHER RESEARCH BLI IN FY 1990

Digitized by Google

01/24/89 9:30 AM (90ITEMB)
(FY1990/PRESBUD/90ITEMB)
Numbers enclosed in > are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM B -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

FY 1990 - DESCRIPTION - EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
FOREST RESEARCH:					
Forest Protection Research	31,490	33,181	37,660	34,537	32,204
Resource Analysis Research	25,353	25,617	27,861	26,910	25,554
Timber Management Research	26,548	26,972	33,272	28,511	26,454
Forest Environment Research	29,259	31,100	35,511	31,712	29,716
Forest Products and Harvesting Research	19,860	20,497	23,466	20,830	19,871
Special Projects, Competitive Grants	3,000	0	0	0	0
Research cha lenge cost share progra 1/	0	500	0	0	0
TOTAL, FOREST RESEARCH	135,510	137,867	157,770	142,500	133,799
STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY:					
Forest Pest Management:					
Federa Lands:					
Surveys and Technical Assistance	13,689	14,135	15,900	15,572	15,572
Insect and Disease Suppression	16,959	15,854	19,163	19,163	19,163
Special Projects	1,216	1,211	2,869	2,869	2,869
Cooperative Lands:					
Surveys and Technical Assistance	2,077	2,077	3,340	2,302	2,302
Insect and Disease Suppression	10,500	10,000	10,141	1,700	1,700
Appalachian IPM	0	5,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, Forest Pest Management	44,441	49,677	51,413	41,606	41,606
Fire Protection	13,770	13,851	13,041	9,854	4,000
Forest Management and Utilization:					
Forest Resource Management	4,993	4,983	5,400	4,555	0
Wood Ut lization	1,994	991	4,092	1,092	0
Seedlings, Nursery, and Tree Improvement	1,798	1,795	1,962	1,962	0
Urban Forestry	1,998	2,496	2,000	2,000	0
Subtotal, Forest Management and Utilization	10,783	10,265	13,454	9,609	0
Special Projects:					
Boundary Waters Canoe Area	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies	200	200	0	0	0
Lake Tahoe (PL 96-586)	1,400	1,400	0	0	0
Cache La Poudre River Corridor	75	0	0	0	0
Kellogg, ID Gondola	6,400	0	0	0	0
Centennial Trail--Washington	0	3,000	0	0	0
Centennial Trail--Idaho	0	1,350	0	0	0
Two Forks Resource Analysis--Colorado	0	75	0	0	0
Timber Bridge Initiative	0	2,700	0	0	0
Economic Diversification Studies	0	500	0	0	0
New England Timber Resource Analysis	0	250	0	0	0
Subtotal, Special Projects	10,075	12,075	3,000	3,000	3,000
TOTAL, STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY	79,069	86,668	80,908	64,069	48,606

1/ Included within Other Research Line Items in FY90

Digitized by Google

01/24/89 - 9:30 AM (90ITEM8)
(FY1990/PRESBUD/90ITEM8)
Numbers enclosed in () are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM 8 -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

FY 1990 DESCRIPTION EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM:					
Land and Resource Protection:					
Minerals Area Management:					
Locatable Minerals	9,681	11,643	13,700	13,700	12,146
Leasable Minerals	11,375	11,815	13,976	13,976	11,257
Common Variety Minerals	2,776	2,832	3,358	3,358	3,258
Geology	2,871	2,949	3,542	3,542	2,962
Subtotal, Mineral Area Management	26,683	28,439	34,584	34,584	29,623
Real Estate Management:					
Land Exchange & Adjustment	5,265	6,445	7,097	7,097	5,220
Land Classification, Status & Planning	2,415	3,063	4,438	4,438	3,404
Special Uses	8,986	10,256	11,092	11,092	8,050
Geometronics	5,168	5,739	6,856	6,856	5,220
Subtotal, Real Estate Management	21,834	25,503	30,283	30,283	22,694
Land Line Location	26,651	28,678	29,677	28,898	28,898
Maintenance of Facilities	16,533	17,553	23,529	17,902	16,953
Forest Fire Protection:					
Fire Presuppression	156,477	158,707	181,535	164,204	164,204
Fuels Management	8,552	7,909	12,401	8,935	8,935
Subtotal, Forest Fire Protection	165,029	166,616	193,936	173,139	173,139
Fighting Forest Fires	125,000	125,000	1,059	85,000	85,000
Cooperative Law Enforcement	9,669	10,615	11,658	11,658	11,245
Forest Road Maintenance	83,740	88,729	92,200	82,040	68,133
Forest Trail Maintenance	20,026	20,797	23,327	24,262	17,366
Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	4,388	0	0	0
Subtotal, Including Other Funds	20,026	25,185	23,327	24,262	17,366
Total, Land & Resource Protection	495,165	503,938	440,245	487,758	453,051
Total, Including Other Funds	495,165	508,318	440,245	487,758	453,051
Renewable Resource Management & Utilization:					
Sales Administration and Management:					
Timber Resource Inventory Planning	16,177	17,278	19,450	19,450	19,450
Silvicultural Examination	26,619	27,608	34,382	34,382	31,606
Sales Preparation	98,432	105,096	121,596	121,596	114,612
Harvest Administration	44,333	57,556	67,312	67,312	66,967
Subtotal, Sales Admin. & Mgmt.	185,561	207,538	242,660	242,660	232,635
Resource Management Timber Receipts	0	21,938	0	0	0
Subtotal, Including Other Funds	185,561	229,476	242,660	242,660	232,635
TIMBER TARGETS:	Targets:				
Sales Preparation - MMBF	11,348	11,505	11,374	11,374	11,029
[illegible] MMBF	11,348	11,505	11,374	11,625	11,351

Digitized by Google

1 01 9 - 9:30 AM (90ITEMB)
2 (FY:90/PRESBUD/90ITEMB)
3 Numbers enclosed in () are not included in
4 totals. Requests to Department and OMB are
5 less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM B -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

6 / 7 FY 1990 - DESCRIPTION - EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
8					
30					
31 Reforestation & Stand Improvement:					
32 Reforestation	22,021	22,527	25,730	25,730	25,730
33 Timber Stand Improvement (TSI)	18,235	26,899	37,353	37,353	13,156
34 Nursery and Tree Improvement Operations	14,667	15,859	19,956	19,956	19,346
35 Subtotal, Reforestation & TSI	54,923	65,285	83,039	83,039	58,232
36 Reforestation Trust Fund	30,907	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
37 Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	7,312	0	0	0
38 Subtotal, Including Other Funds	85,830	102,597	113,039	113,039	88,232
39					
40 Recreation Use:					
41 Recreation Managment	96,945	111,583	126,284	110,485	99,418
42 Wilderness Management	12,581	14,692	16,058	13,392	12,585
43 Cultural Resource Management	14,216	15,979	22,278	19,551	13,843
144 Subtotal, Recreation Use	123,742	142,254	164,620	143,428	125,846
145 Resource Management. Timber Receipts	0	7,312	0	0	0
146 Operation & Maintenance of Rec. Facilities	0	0	9,000	16,500	9,000
147 Subtotal, Including Other Funds	123,742	149,566	173,620	159,928	134,846
148					
149 Wild fe and Fish Habitat Management:					
150 Wildl fe & Fisheries Admin. Resource Coord.	29,352	34,792	39,678	36,750	36,000
151 Wildl fe Habitat Improvement	5,634	6,951	12,740	9,900	7,000
152 Inland Fish Habitat Improvement	3,896	6,202	6,124	5,000	5,000
153 Endang. Threat Sensitive Species Hab. Imp.	4,489	7,150	5,454	5,150	5,000
154 Anadromous Fish	4,123	9,899	7,430	7,394	7,000
155 Subtotal, Wildlife Fish Habitat Management	47,444	64,994	71,426	64,994	60,000
156 Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	14,625	0	0	0
157 Subtotal, Including Other Funds	47,444	79,619	71,426	64,994	60,000
158					
159 Range Management:					
160 Range Vegetation Management	25,670	26,966	31,502	29,492	23,884
161 Range Forage Improvement	274	756	772	471	384
162 Range Structural Improvement	1,442	1,185	1,213	883	719
163 Wild Horses & Burro Management	286	181	237	225	183
164 Noxious Weed Control	1,553	1,559	2,708	1,424	1,161
165 Subtotal, Range Management	29,225	30,567	36,432	32,495	26,331
166					
167 Soi Water and Ai Management:					
168 Soil, Water, & Air Operations	25,677	29,922	39,593	39,183	27,029
169 Soi & Water Resource Improvement	3,291	6,248	3,647	3,647	2,777
170 Soi Inventory	6,303	6,634	5,037	5,037	4,177
171 Subtota Soil, Water & Air Management	35,271	42,804	48,277	47,787	33,983
172 Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	14,625	0	0	0
173 Subtotal, Including Other Funds	35,271	57,429	48,277	47,787	33,983
174					
175 Total, Renewable Resource Mgmt. & Util.	476,166	553,442	646,454	614,483	537,227
176 Total, Including Other Funds	507,873	649,254	685,454	660,983	576,227
177					
178					
179					
180					

Digitized by Google

=qw 4 - 24-Jan(

01/24/8> 9:30 AM (90ITEM8)
(FY1990/PRESBUD/90ITEM8)
Numbers enclosed in () are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less data led than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM 8 -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

FY 1990 DESCRIPTION EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
General Administration	268,660	272,116	287,200	288,000	275,336
Reappropriation of Unobligated Balances	0	9,117	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM	1,239,991	1,338,605	1,373,899	1,382,161	1,265,614
Less: NFS Fire--Current Law	0	0	0	0	(258,139)
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM	1,239,991	1,338,605	1,373,899	1,382,161	1,007,475
Total, Other Funds:					
Federal Wildland Firefighting--Proposed	0	0	0	0	281,992
Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	70,200	0	0	0
Reforestation Trust Fund	30,907	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Oper. & Maintenance of Rec. Facilities	0	0	9,000	16,500	9,000
TOTAL, NFS, INCLUDING OTHER FUNDS	1,270,898	1,438,805	1,412,899	1,428,661	1,328,467
CONSTRUCTION:					
Construction of Facilities:					
Research Construction	2,900	1,550	11,600	4,500	2,600
Construction for FA&O	6,745	8,321	16,575	16,575	6,500
Recreation Use Areas Construction	17,999	24,043	21,628	20,822	7,900
Subtotal, Construction of Facilities	27,643	33,914	49,803	41,897	17,000
Oper. & Maintenance of Rec. Facilities	0	0	0	7,500	7,500
Subtotal, Including Other Funds	27,643	33,914	49,803	48,597	24,500
Forest Road Construction	171,784	175,657	216,177	210,616	186,000
Forest Trail Construction	14,671	15,947	16,100	18,257	18,000
Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	2,925	0	0	0
Subtotal, Tr. Const. Including Other Funds	14,671	18,872	16,100	18,257	18,000
Construction of Roads by Tbr Purch (PCP) --1/	(103,781)	(120,770)	(142,868)	(142,668)	(139,579)
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	214,078	225,518	282,000	269,970	221,000
Total, Other Funds:					
Resource Management, Timber Receipts	0	2,925	0	0	0
Oper. & Maintenance of Rec. Facilities	0	0	0	0	7,500
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION, INCLUDING OTHER FUNDS	214,078	228,443	282,000	269,970	228,500
LAND ACQUISITION (L&WCF):					
Acquisition Management	4,181	4,600	5,554	5,554	5,554
Acquisitions	44,895	59,605	0	0	0
TOTAL, LAND ACQUISITION (L&WCF)	49,076	64,205	5,554	5,554	5,554

--1/ FY89: $75,500,000 New Authorization, $120,770,000 Estimated Use

Digitized by Google

01/24/85 9:30 AM (90ITEMS)
(FY1990/PRESBUD/90ITEMS)
Numbers enclosed in are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM 8 -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

FY 1990 DESCRIPTION EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
ACQ. OF LANDS FOR NF SPECIAL ACTS	966	966	1,068	1,068	1,068
ACQ. OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES	385	335	1,070	1,070	1,070
GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH	3	90	95	95	30
RANGE BETTERMENT FUND	3,695	3,946	4,700	4,700	4,700
O & M RECREATION FACILITIES- Current	0	0	9,000	9,000	9,000
O & M RECREATION FACILITIES- Proposed	0	0	0	7,500	7,500
Total, O & M RECREATION FACILITIES	0	0	9,000	16,500	16,500
YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS	(1,000)	(1,000)	0	0	0
TIMBER SALVAGE SALES	(37,000)	0	0	0	0
TONGASS TIMBER SUPPLY FUND	50,003	35,999	40,985	40,985	40,985
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IMBER RECEIPTS	0	73,125	0	0	0
--Less Tongass TSF in FY88,FY90 Base and Estimate	(50,003)	0	(40,985)	(40,985)	(40,985)
HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MOUNT ST. HELENS NVM	0	5,333	0	0	0
TOTAL, APPROPRIATED FUNDS	1,723,483	1,972,657	1,916,144	1,887,607	1,439,882
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, WORKING FUNDS:					
Expenses, Brush Disposal	58,607	54,680	64,662	64,662	64,662
Licensee Programs: Woodsy/Smokey	106	109	119	119	119
Restoration of Forest Lands & Improvements	80	107	106	106	106
Timber Roads, Purchaser Elections, FS (PEP)	21,037	9,637	4,878	4,878	4,878
--Prog.Level	(4,338)	(5,040)	(4,878)	(4,878)	(4,878)
--Rescission	(75,000)	(40,000)	0	0	0
Timber Salvage Sales	66,174	47,561	24,997	24,997	29,997
--Prog.Level	(61,502)				
Tongass Timber Supply Fund	50,003	35,999	40,985	40,985	40,985
--Prog.Level	(49,379)				
Road and Trail 10% Fund	(88,878)	(92,374)	0	0	0
Operation and Maintenance of Quarters	5,610	5,869	5,852	5,852	5,852
Federal Wildland Firefighting:					
-Fire Protection, Presuppression	156,477	158,787	0	0	164,204
-Fire Protection, Fuels Management	8,552	7,909	0	0	8,935
Subtotal Fire Protection	165,029	166,616	0	0	173,139
-Emergency Suppression and Rehabilitation	125,000	125,000	0	0	108,853
Total, Federal Wildland Firefighting	290,029	291,616	0	0	281,992
Subtotal, Working Funds	491,646	445,778	141,599	141,599	428,591
--Less FY86 & FY89 NFS Fire, FY89 TTSF	(290,029)	(327,615)	0	0	0
Subtotal, Working Funds	201,617	118,163	141,599	141,599	428,591

Digitized by Google

01/2 AM (90ITEMS)
(FY19. RESBUD/90ITEMS)
Numbers enclosed in () are not included in totals. Requests to Department and OMB are less detailed than shown.

USDA - FOREST SERVICE
ITEM 8 -- BUDGET REQUEST HISTORY TABLE

FY 1990 - DESCRIPTION - EXPANDED VERSION	FY 1988 FINAL	FY 1989 APPROP.	FY 1990 REQUEST TO DEPARTMENT	FY 1990 REQUEST TO OMB	FY 1990 REQUEST TO CONGRESS
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, PAYMENTS TO STATES:					
Payment to Minnesota	716	716	716	716	716
Payment to Counties, National Grasslands	6,750	16,413	16,675	16,675	16,675
Proposed Legislation	0	0	0	(576)	(2,963)
Net, National Grasslands	6,750	16,413	16,675	16,099	13,692
Payments to States, National Forests Fund 1/	293,295	338,825	328,975	328,975	347,725
Proposed Legislation	0	0	0	(15,726)	(61,271)
Net, National Forests Fund	293,295	338,825	328,975	313,249	286,454
Subtotal, Payments to States	300,761	355,954	346,366	330,064	300,862
TOTAL, PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS	502,378	474,117	487,965	471,663	729,453
COOPERATIVE WORK, FOREST SERVICE (Trust Fund)					
Cooperative Work, K-V:					
KV Reforestation	114,123	114,032	152,033	152,033	152,033
KV Timber Stand Improvement	31,131	34,943	36,987	36,987	36,987
KV Other	92,748	55,170	61,802	61,802	61,802
Subtotal, Cooperative Work, KV	238,002	204,145	250,822	250,822	250,822
Cooperative Work, Other	58,332	63,603	64,295	64,295	64,295
TOTAL, COOPERTIVE WORK, FOREST SERVICE	296,334	267,748	315,117	315,117	315,117
REFORESTATION TRUST FUND	30,907	30,000	30,000	30,500	30,000
TOTAL, REGULAR FOREST SERVICE	2,553,102	2,744,522	2,749,226	2,704,467	2,514,372

1/ 25% of FY 1988 & 1989 salvage sale receipts shall be paid to States.

Digitized by Google

	Budget Authority ($ Million)					
		1990 Reagan		1990 2/	1990 2/	1990 F.S.
	1989 /1	$	% Change	LMP	% of LMP	Cost-Share
NFS:	$	$		$		$
Minerals	28.4	29.6	4%	39.8	74%	
Real Estate	25.5	22.7	-11%	37.7	60%	
Land Line Location	28.7	28.9	0	40.8	71%	
Maintenance of Facility	17.6	17.0	-3%	28.2	60%	
Forest Fire Protection	166.6	173.1	-4%	204.0	85%	
Fighting Fire	125.0	108.9	-13%			
Cooperative Law	10.6	11.2	6%	13.2	85%	
Road Maintenance	80.7	68.1	-16%	113.4	60%	
Trail Maintenance	25.2	17.4	-31%	28.6	61%	(0.8)
Timber Sales	229.5	232.8	1%	277.9	84%	
Reforestation/TSI	102.6	88.2	-14%	123.0	72%	
Recreation	149.6	134.8	-10%	230.0	59%	(1.6)
Wildlife & Fish	79.6	60.0	-25%	107.5	56%	(6.0)
Range	30.6	26.3	-14%	48.2	55%	
Soil & Water	57.4	34.0	-41%	68.3	50%	
CONSTRUCTION:						
FA&O	8.3	6.5	-22%	45.6	14%	
Recreation	24.0	15.4	-36%	56.3	27%	(1.8)
Roads	175.7	186.0	6%	310.8	60%	(1.5)
Trails	18.9	18.0	-5%	26.4	68%	(1.3)

1_/ Includes Reforestation Trust Fund ($30), O&M Rec Facilities ($17), and Special Timber Receipts ($73)

2/ Field Cost Only

Digitized by Google

Wildlife Management Institute
Suite 725, 1101 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 • 202/371-1808

LAURENCE R. JAHN
President
LONNIE L. WILLIAMSON
Vice-President
RICHARD E. McCABE
Secretary
DANIEL A. POOLE
Board Chairman

March 1, 1989

The Honorable Robert F. Smith
118 Cannon Office Building
The House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Smith:

In reviewing 1990 budget requests, we identified a serious threat to an essential project--the elk/cattle/deer/timber interaction study ("The Starkey Study") in Oregon. A reduction of $106,000 is proposed for this heralded research being conducted by USDA Forest Service and state cooperators at the Starkey Experimental Forest near La Grande.

Investments have been made in the study totaling near $3 million, including $750,000 by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. We recommend strongly that the $106,000 be restored. It is required to collect field data to establish base line information essential to evaluate changes resulting from various forest/wildlife experimental treatments. Those findings are needed to strengthen the informational base used to complete the next management plans for the National Forests and help ensure multiple benefits important to the environment and economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Sincerely,

Laurence R. Jahn
President

LRJ:dt

DEDICATED TO WILDLIFE SINCE 1911

Digitized by Google

UNION COUNTY
County Court

JOHN J. HOWARD, County Judge
MARIE C. LESTER, County Commissioner
LORENCE "Doc" SAVAGE, County Commissioner

1106 "K" AVENUE LA GRANDE, OREGON 97850 PHONE (503) 963-1001

February 23, 1989

Honorable Robert Smith
U.S. Representative
118 Cannon Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Smith:

The La Grande Forestry and Range Sciences Laboratory has a broad research program that provides information on a variety of game and non-game wildlife habitat issues, and on management of rangeland or forests for forage production. Preeminent among this research is the large elk, cattle, deer, and timber interaction research program at the Starkey Experimental Forest near La Grande, Oregon. This research will provide vitally needed information on animal unit month equations for cattle and wild herbivores, on the impact of forest management and road use on wildlife, and elk breeding information needed by the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife.

Because of the importance of this research program, Region 6 of the Forest Service has invested almost $2 million in establishing the study area, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has invested $750,000 in the study.

The funding proposed for this unit by the President's FY 1990 Budget is a reduction of $106,000 for the Planned Program Base for the Forest Service. The impact of this reduction will be to eliminate much of the resources needed to collect field data for the widely publicized "Elk/Deer/Cattle/Timber Study" (Starkey Study). Inability to collect field data during the critical start up phase of the study will eliminate base line data needed to understand changes caused by various research treatments.

Digitized by Google

Honorable Robert Smith
February 23, 1989
Page 2

The information essential to land-use planning that the study was designed to provide will not be available for the next round of forest planning. This will result in decisions being made that have decided impact on the economy and environment of the Pacific Northwest in absence of timber management that are required for efficient land use that will indeed provide multiple use.

We strongly urge you to work to restore this budget cut so that the "Starkey Study" can be continued.

Respectfully,

John J. Howard
County Judge

Marie C. Lester
Commissioner

Lorence D. Savage
Commissioner

sb

cc: Dr. Jack Ward Thomas
Forestry & Range Sciences Laboratory

DEPOSIT
MAY 31 1989
SHIPPED

96-470 (72)

Digitized by Google

Y 4.AG 8/1:101-2 C.1
Wildfire Suppression A
Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 045 083 222

DATE DUE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google